

THE ENGLISH BIBLE:

*AN EXTERNAL AND CRITICAL HISTORY OF THE
VARIOUS ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS
OF SCRIPTURE,*

WITH REMARKS ON THE NEED OF
REVISING THE ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

JOHN EADIE, D.D., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS,
UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

London:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
1876.

All rights reserved.

"Howsoever these things are in men's depraved judgments and affections, yet Truth which only doth judge itself, teacheth that the inquiry of truth, which is the love-making or wooing of it, and the belief of truth, which is the enjoying of it, is the sovereign good of human nature."—BACON.

"The Jesuit reasons thus: if the scriptures should be read by the people in the vulgar tongue, then new versions should be made in every age, because languages are changed every age. But this would be impossible, because there would be a lack of persons fit to make the versions; and, if it were possible, it would be absurd that the versions should be so often changed. Therefore the scriptures ought not to be read in the vernacular tongue.

"I answer, this argument is ridiculous. For, in the first place, it is false that languages change every age; since the primary tongues, the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, have not undergone such frequent alterations. Secondly, there is never in Christian churches a lack of some sufficient interpreters, able to translate the scriptures and render their genuine meaning in the vulgar tongue. Thirdly, no inconvenience will follow if interpretations or versions of scripture, when they have become obsolete and ceased to be easily intelligible, be afterwards changed and corrected."—WHITAKER, 1588.

BS455

E2

v. 1

TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND CHARLES J. ELLICOTT, D.D.,

BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL,

CHAIRMAN ;

AND TO THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COMPANY

ENGAGED IN THE REVISION OF THE

ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT,

THESE VOLUMES ARE VERY CORDIALLY

INSCRIBED.

steckert - Hafner C. 50 (3.25/v.) 2. 12. 59

27753

PREFACE.

THE following pages have been written to tell the story of the English Bible, and it is a story of singular interest to all who speak the English tongue. No pains have been spared to present the narrative in its truth, and to disentangle it from conflicting statements and traditional errors.

Many thanks are due to those who have gone before me. Mr. Lewis, in his "Complete History of the several Translations of the Holy Bible and New Testament into English," published in 1731, pointed the way. Yet, so little interest was the public supposed to feel in such a work, that his first edition consisted only of 140 copies in folio ; and the presentiment was verified, for the sale was so very slow that the second edition, in octavo, did not appear till eight years afterwards. His book has many merits ; its defects may be ascribed to the scantier knowledge of his time ; but its blunders have led some noted historians far astray. Other writings on the same special theme, as those of

Johnson, Newcome, Whittaker, Walter, Conant, and the "Brief Account" prefixed to Bagster's "Hexapla," though they are of varying value, are not without their use.

But the publication of Christopher Anderson's "Annals of the English Bible," in 1845, formed an epoch; for the work was the fruit of independent investigation, and its author brought to light some new facts about Tyndale, and discovered some unsuspected editions of his New Testament. Mr. Anderson's original purpose had been to compile a biography of the martyred translator, and had that purpose not been partially abandoned, or rather supplemented, his volumes might have possessed more compactness and symmetry. His "Annals," however, are wholly external in character, for he never attempts to give any critical estimate of Tyndale's version, either of its English style, its fidelity to the original Greek, or its nearer or remoter relation to Luther and the Vulgate. The work, indeed, grew under his hand to a great size, for it is filled to overflowing with extraneous or collateral matter, and every page might have been printed in three parallel columns, headed in succession—"History of the English Nation," "History of the English Church," "History of the English Bible." Now and then the good man is swayed by prejudice, as when he avers that, from principle, Tyndale would not, and did not, translate any portion of the Apocrypha, though the evidence to the contrary was lying before his eyes,

in the "Epistles" for Church Service, taken from Esther, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus, attached to his famous revised edition of 1534. So jealous was he for Tyndale's fame and honour that he studiously, and on every occasion, depreciates Coverdale, who, though he was not endowed with Tyndale's high nobility of nature, yet possessed eminent qualities, and did a good secondary work when no one else thought of attempting it. I have endeavoured to weigh the merits of each translator, or company of translators, with open impartiality.

Special and grateful reference cannot but be made to Canon Westcott's very able, accurate, and scholarly "General View of the History of the English Bible," 1868; to Prebendary Scrivener's careful and thorough "Introduction" to the Quarto Paragraph Bible, Cambridge, 1873; to some papers—too few and too brief—by Dr. Moulton in the "Bible Educator"; and to several volumes of minute and patient labour, in the form of elaborate collations and fac-simile reproduction, by the esteemed and obliging Mr. Francis Fry, of Bristol.

I have tried to trace the English Bible down from Anglo-Saxon times, and have added a very few remarks on the changes which passed over the old language in those distant centuries. Wycliffe has been often portrayed as a Reformer, but, as it was more to my purpose, I have sketched him as a Translator, divined his motives, and thrown into

relief the fresh and graphic English of his wonderful version. The reader will find brief biographies of the men who engaged, at different periods, in the work of translation—a work sometimes perilous, and always very responsible; and that work is candidly judged in itself, as well as in its connection with previous, and its influence upon subsequent, versions. The introduction into Scotland of the various editions, and their effect on that kingdom, have not been overlooked. Considerable space is devoted to our present Bible, usually, though not with strict accuracy, called “The Authorized Version,” and I have entered into some points of its history as a printed volume after its publication in 1611.

The old spelling is given where it is characteristic; and as the book is not meant for scholars only, but also for persons of ordinary education and intelligence, Latin and Greek terms are, for the most part, printed at the bottom of the pages. Errors are unavoidable in such a multifarious work, but it is hoped that none of them are unpardonable. No verses are marked in Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Great Bible, and the attempt to facilitate reference by numbering them according to the Authorized Version may have led to some discrepancies.

In fine, some chapters in the concluding portion of the second volume discuss the subject of Revision, showing that there is a general necessity for it, and that no one needs either to be startled by it, or to be

suspicious about its results; for through successive revisions our Bible has come to be what it is, as a faithful and popular translation. May the rich and suggestive History that has wreathed itself round our Book of books stir up a profounder thankfulness to the Giver of all good, and may its own truths live in the hearts of all who read it!

I tender my best thanks to my friend the Rev. William Young, Parkhead, for looking over the sheets, and especially for compiling the accurate and complete Index.

6 THORNVILLE TERRACE, HILLHEAD,
GLASGOW, *March*, 1876.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTORY.

Old Versions of the Scriptures in Keltic Dialects of Britain—in Anglo-Saxon—
The English Tongue—Saxon Element.—*First Period*—Cædmon—Guthlac
—Aldhelm—Bede—King Alfred—Anglo-Saxon Glosses—Ælfric.—*Second
Period*—The Normans—Introduction of French—Two Languages—Ascend-
ancy of English—Effects of the Norman Conquest upon the English Tongue
—Translations into Early English—The Ormulum—Schorham and
Hampole—Gospels and Psalms first selected for Translation—Popularity of
the Psalter—Anglo-Saxon and Old English in Scotland, Page 3

WYCLIFFE.

CHAPTER I.

Reasons why Men should have the Word of God in their own Tongue—Time
and Place of Wycliffe's Birth—Academic Life—Preferred to Rectory of
Lutterworth—His Doctrines condemned—Death from Paralysis—Literary
Works—Three Epochs in his Life, 37

CHAPTER II.

Various Influences which led Wycliffe to translate the Scriptures—Papal Rapacity
—The Great Schism—Degeneracy of Mendicant Orders—Alarming Con-
dition of the State and the Church—The Black Death—Wat Tyler's
Revolt—Not connected with Wycliffe's Teachings—Wycliffe no Demagogue
—Polemical Tractates—An English Bible the Nation's Need—His Purity of
Character—His Aim in translating the Scriptures—The First Translator
of the Entire Bible into English—Trevisa's Claims—Groundless Assertions
of More and others—His Eulogy, 44

CHAPTER III.

Wycliffe's Personal Work in the Translation—Nicholas de Hereford—The Continuator—Purvey—His Prologue and Revision—Spread of Education—English of Wycliffe—Still easily read—Obsolete Terms—Similar Terms which still survive in Scotch—Slight Change of Spelling gives Modern Aspect to many of his Words, 64

CHAPTER IV.

Rapid Diffusion of Wycliffe's Bible—Great Interest of Surviving Copies—Hostility to Wycliffe's Bible—His Writings and his Bones condemned to the Flames—Persecution of his Followers—The Term "Lollard"—Act de Heretico Comburendo—Passed at the Instigation of Archbishop Arundel—Fires of Smithfield—Execution of Lord Cobham—The Arundel Constitutions—The Commons address the King on the Wealth of the Church—War with France—Stealthy Reading of the Bible—Cost of a Bible—A Crime to possess a Copy—Nefarious Means of Detection—Attachment of Wycliffites to Scripture—The "Bible Readers"—Influence of Wycliffe had not ceased when that of Tyndale began—Translations in Scotland—The Old Scottish Tongue 79

TYNDALE.

CHAPTER V.

Wycliffe's Bible only a Version from a Version—Knowledge of Greek in Britain—Early Teachers of Greek—Influence of the Knowledge of Greek upon the Study of the Scriptures—Invention of Printing—Gutenberg—Caxton, 101

CHAPTER VI.

Date and Place of Tyndale's Birth disputed—Goes to College at an Early Age—Early Devotion to the Scriptures—Excellence of his Character—May have studied under Erasmus at Cambridge—Was Tyndale ordained?—Tutor in the House of Sir John Walsh—His Translation of the Enchiridion of Erasmus—Railed at by the Clergy—Leaves the Family of Sir John Walsh—Asks Admission into the Household of Tunstall—Humphrey Munmouth's Kindness to him—His Manner of Life in London—The Value of Money then—The Title "Sir" as given to Tyndale, 107

CHAPTER VII.

Tyndale leaves England—Takes up his Residence at Hamburg—Not a Lutheran—His Work different from that of Luther—Did he visit Wittenberg?—

Connection with Luther—Knowledge of German—Leaves Hamburg for Cologne—Flight to Worms—Printing of Octavo and Quarto Editions of his New Testament, 120

CHAPTER VIII.

Tyndale's Noble and Disinterested Motives—Sacrifices—Modesty—Scholarship—Sole Translator—Friar Royce—Grammars and Lexicons within his Reach—Greek Testament of Erasmus—Tyndale translated directly from the Greek, 133

CHAPTER IX.

Relation of Tyndale's New Testament to German Version of Luther—Alleged Germanisms merely Old English—Did not translate from the Vulgate—Blunders of Macknight and others on this point—Tyndale's Untrammelled Use of the Vulgate—It suggests many Renderings to him—Defects of the Version—Neglect of Connecting Particles—Occasionally Paraphrastic—Quaint and Homely Renderings—Happy and Pithy Phrases—Fuller's Eulogy—Archaic Forms and Irregular Spelling—Tyndale's Volumes despatched to England, 143

CHAPTER X.

Date of the Arrival of Tyndale's New Testaments in England—Reasons against date assigned by Anderson and others—Testimony of Cochlaus—Activity of Garret—Cottysford—Henry's Letter to Luther—Seizure of Garret at Oxford—Trial of Prior Barnes—Necton's Confession—Circulation of the New Testament, 161

CHAPTER XI.

Fierce Opposition to the New Testament by Men in authority—Position of Wolsey—Tunstall's Manifesto—Archbishop Warham's Mandate—Bishop Nikke's Letter—Third Edition of New Testament issued at Antwerp—Conveyed to England along with Cargoes of Wheat—Secret Circulation—Detection and Arrests—Efforts to check the Torrent at its Source in Antwerp—Copies of New Testament collected and burned—Harman—Hacket's Zeal gets him into Trouble—Herman Rinck of Cologne—Treaty of Cambray—Tunstall outwitted by Packington—George Constantine—More's Perplexity—Bishop Nikke's Despair—Another Condemnation of the New Testament—Prohibitions and Burnings of New Testament ineffectual—Charged by Tunstall with more than Two Thousand Errors, 171

CHAPTER XII.

Critical Vituperation of More—Tyndale's Answer—The two Men did not understand each other—More's Anomalous Character—His Zeal against Heretics—His Outrageous Railing—His Opinion with regard to Translations—His Criticism of Tyndale's English—His Confession of Defeat, 187

CHAPTER XIII.

Tyndale's whole Nature filled with his Work—Rebuts Objections against an English Translation—Prior Buckenham's Reply to Latimer—Tyndale joined by Fryth at Marburg—Translates the Pentateuch and Jonah—His Expositions—Bilney's Martyrdom—How Tyndale acquired his Knowledge of Hebrew—Translated directly from the Hebrew—Token of his Love of Hebrew Study—Proofs of his Knowledge of Hebrew—Quaint and Homely Renderings in his Pentateuch, 200

CHAPTER XIV.

Tyndale takes up his Final Abode at Antwerp—Fryth wins the Crown of Martyrdom—Tyndale's Desire to improve his Translation of New Testament—George Joye's Edition—Tyndale's Revised Translation—Warns against Joye's Production—Joye's Duplicity—His Apology—His Account of the Spurious Editions—Joye's Change of the Word "Resurrection" into "Life after this"—Joye rebuts the Charge of Covetousness—His Ambition and Spite—Not privy to the Plan for apprehending Tyndale—Titles and Prologues of Tyndale's Second Edition—His Protestation—The Revision thorough—Collation of the Two Editions—Terms changed in course of Successive Editions—Harman released from Prison—Tyndale presents Queen Anne with Copy of his Revised Edition—Tyndale's Third Edition—Collation—Edition of 1535 marked by Peculiar Spelling, 216

CHAPTER XV.

Vaughan's Interviews with Tyndale—Tyndale's Manner of Life at Antwerp—Sir T. Elyot undertakes the Task of seizing Tyndale—Thomas Poyntz—Philips and Donne win Tyndale's Confidence and betray him—His Imprisonment in Castle of Vilvorde—Vain Efforts of Poyntz and Tibold to procure his Release—Tyndale's New Testament printed in England—Crumwell writes twice in his Favour—Touching Letter of Tyndale to Marquis of Bergen-op-Zoom—His Trial—His Martyrdom and Last Words—Tyndale's Independence of Wycliffe, 235

CHAPTER XVI.

Tyndale's New Testaments find their way into Scotland—Patrick Hamilton—Letter of Ales to James V.—Henry Forrest of Linlithgow condemned and burned, 245

COVERDALE.

CHAPTER XVII.

Comparison of the Characters of Tyndale and Coverdale—Coverdale's Birth and Early History—Patronage of Crumwell—Connection with Barnes—Influence on Thomas Topley—Association with Tyndale—In Obscurity—Decision of Council at Westminster, in regard to Question of Authorized Bible—Latimer's Letter to the King—Convocation of 1534—Cranmer's Project—Bishop Gardyners Part in the Work—Coverdale's Translation steals as a Stranger into the Country—Time eventful—Title-page, Dedication, and Prologue—Preface to the Apocrypha—Probably printed by Froschover, of Zürich—All Divinity Lectures shall be on the Scriptures, 251

CHAPTER XVIII.

Change in Title from Queen Anne to Queen Jane—Coverdale not self-moved, but urged by Others, to the Work of Translation—Froude's Error in representing the King as originating the Version—Coverdale the One Workman—Errors of Whittaker, Blunt, and Others—Coverdale's Views on Translation—His Version taken from German and Latin—"Used Five Sundry Interpreters"—Error in Title-page of "Bagster's Second Modern Edition" of Coverdale—Blunders of Whittaker—Ginsburg's Remarks—Coverdale's Old Testament based chiefly on Zürich Bible, 272

CHAPTER XIX.

Coverdale's Notes—Whence Derived—Examples in Detail—Collation of some Verses of Genesis as found in Tyndale and Coverdale—Coverdale's New Testament Based on Tyndale's, with many Variations—Renderings of Coverdale retained in Authorized Version, 286

CHAPTER XX.

Quaint and Antique Renderings in Coverdale—Obsolete Terms—Coverdale always musical—New Editions—The Diglott—Coverdale's Bible printed at Zürich, published in London, 298

THOMAS MATTHEW'S BIBLE.

CHAPTER XXI.

This Bible a Compilation—Title-page and Dedication—The Compiler John Rogers—Thomas Matthews an Assumed Name—Personal History of Rogers—Quits England for Antwerp—Intimacy with Tyndale—Marriage—Origination of the Volume not known—Grafton and Whitechurch assume the burden of Printing—Inaccurate Statements in regard to this Bible by Grafton and Others, 309

CHAPTER XXII.

Matthew's Bible made up of the Translations of Tyndale and Coverdale—Respective Parts of each—Mr. Fry's Collation—The First Authorized Version, 319

CHAPTER XXIII.

The Work of Rogers not merely Mechanical—Prefatory Matter—Rogers did not attempt a thorough Revision—Differences between Coverdale and Matthew—Notes at the Ends of the Chapters—Anti-Papal Notes, 326

CHAPTER XXIV.

Cranmer's Connection with Matthew's Bible—His Letters to Crumwell—Royal Proclamation—Peculiar Decision and Boldness implied in licensing Matthew's Bible at such a time—The Dedication—Grafton's Fortune embarked in the Enterprise—His Fear of Rival Editions—The Age of Hand-Bibles not yet come, 335

CHAPTER XXV.

Revised Edition of Matthew's Bible—Richard Taverner—Dedication—His Scholarship—Changes made by him—Other Editions of Matthew's Bible—Rogers returns to England—Obtains Preferment—Re-establishment of Popery under Mary—Rogers a Prisoner in his own House—Sent to Newgate—Examined before the Privy Council—Condemned along with Hooper—His Martyrdom—His Descendants—Marbeck's Concordance—Marbeck condemned, but not executed—"Servant" altered into "Knave," 343

THE GREAT BIBLE.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Coverdale chosen by Crumwell to revise Matthew's Bible—Errors of Hume and Others in regard to Origin of this Revision—Printed at Paris—Coverdale and Grafton—Bonner's Intercourse with them—The Work forbidden, and the Printer cited before the Inquisitor-General—Finished in London—The Title—Holbein's Frontispiece—Apology for Want of Notes—Coverdale's Pliancy—Crumwell's Injunction for the Circulation of the Bible—Collation of Tyndale and Great Bible—Latin Version of Erasmus consulted for New Testament—Münster and Pagninus for Old Testament—Collation of Second and Twenty-third Psalms—Attempts of Clergy to frustrate Crumwell's Proclamation—The Bible welcomed by the People, 355

CHAPTER XXVII.

Cranmer's Interest in a New Edition of the Bible—His Letter to Crumwell—Royal Patent—Fulke's Story—Coverdale Editor of the Second Great Bible as well as of the First—Cranmer's Prologue—Title—William Barlow, 372

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Changes in Edition of 1540 mainly suggested by Münster's Latin Version—Examples—Collation—Successive Editions of Great Bible—The Authorized Bible—Examples of its Inferiority as a Translation—Period of Stormy Transition—Scenes at Bible Readings—Demand for an English Bible the Political Cry of the Age—Heresy and Treason—Crumwell's Fall—First Edition bearing the Names of Tunstall and Heath—Anthony Marler—Royal Proclamation ordering all Churches to provide themselves with a Bible of the Largest Volume—Royal Warrant for Price of Bibles, 379

CHAPTER XXIX.

Bonner's Injunction in favour of Bible Circulation—Abuses—Reaction—Proposed Revision in the interest of Ecclesiastical Intolerance—Gardyners List of Latin Words to be retained—Cranmer defeats Gardyners Schemes—Reading of the Bible to be placed under legal restraint—Various Abuses—Cruel and Absurd Restrictions—Martyrdom of Anne Askew—"The Supplication of the Poor Commons," 400

CHAPTER XXX.

Enmity of Ecclesiastics in Scotland to English Bible—Beaton's List of Intended Victims—Trial of Thomas Forrest, Vicar of Dollar, and others—Lord Maxwell's Motion—Chancellor Dunbar's Dissent—Every Man free to read the Scriptures in his own Tongue—Regent's Proclamation—Work of Murder recommenced—George Wishart, 414

CHAPTER XXXI.

Accession of Edward VI.—Removal of all Restrictions on Bible Reading—Opposition to English Bible in various Parts of the Country—Insurrection in Devonshire—Sir John Cheke's Translation—Numerous Editions of the Bible in the Reign of Edward—Cranmer and the Burning of Joan of Kent—Accession of Mary—Gardynier and Bonner—Character of Gardynier—Heath—The Bible even in Effigy not to be endured now—Nor any Fragment or Text—Bonner's wrathful Mandate—Numbers who perished during Mary's Reign—Proclamation against Reading and Importation of Scriptures—John Rogers the first to die under Mary—Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, and Others follow—Life of Coverdale after Publication of Great Bible—Summoned before Mary's Council and made a Prisoner at large—Macalpine and Coverdale—Danish King's Letters in favour of Coverdale—His Release and Departure to Denmark—Gardynier's Death—Persecution carried on by Bonner and Pole—Coverdale returns Home after Accession of Elizabeth—Public Merits not rewarded—The Living of St. Magnus—His Poverty—Death—Character—Unjustly disparaged by Anderson—His Epitaph, 420

ERRATA.

Page 77, line 19 from top, *for* "we also," *read* "we have also."
 " 193, " 5 " *for* "piquant," *read* "piquant."
 " 215, " 3 from bottom, *for* "Deuteronomos," *read* "Deuteronomos."
 " 298, " 9 from top, *for* "Judges x," *read* "Judges ix."
 " 380, note 5, *for* "nos," *read* "vos."
 " 385, line 9 from top, *for* "a mothre [putting a garment]," *read* "a moth [frotting a garment]."

THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

INTRODUCTORY.

For it is not much above one hundreth yere ago, sens scripture hath not bene accustomed to be redde in the bulgar tonge within this realme, and many hundred yeres before that, it was translated and redde in the Saxones tonge, whych at that tyme was oure mothers tonge, whereof there remaigneth yet diuers coppes, founde lately in olde Abbeis of soch antique maners of writynge and speaking that fewe men now ben able to reade and understonde them.

Cranmer's Preface to Great Bible, 1540.

INTRODUCTORY.

WHEN Christianity is first introduced into a country, there is ever, on the part of those who accept it from oral teaching, a strong craving to possess its written Records in their own tongue. According to several of the Early Fathers, a similar desire had been felt and gratified in Britain on its reception of the Gospel,¹ though Latin was well understood by the educated classes during the period of Roman supremacy, and was also the language of the earliest Western translation of the Bible. But while copies of the Scriptures, as Gildas records, were burned in the streets of British towns during the persecution under Diocletian, no fragments of any old version in the Keltic dialects of England or Scotland have been preserved.² After the legions were called away, bands of fierce warriors, —Jutes, Saxons, and Angles,—from the shores of the Eider, the Elbe, the Weser, and the Baltic, crossing the sea at various times, invaded and occupied the country, dispossessed the natives, and swept away civilization and Christianity. This barbarian dominion had lasted several dark and dismal years, when the mission of Augustine led to the conversion of Ethelbert, king and Bretwalda, in A.D. 597. The result was that the public services of religion were gradually organized among the pagan³ settlers; the Keltic tribes which had been driven into

¹ Chrysostomi Opera, vol. III, p. 86. Ed. Benedict. Parisiis, 1837. ² The poem of Beowulf had its origin among the pagan Saxons.

³ Opera, English Trans., Giles, Edited by Kemble, London, 1837. p. 10. London, 1844.

Wales, Ireland, and the Hebrides, having preserved no little of their earlier ecclesiastical institutions.¹

While the Catholic Church had its grand and impressive service, it was early and often felt desirable to attempt a translation of the Latin Bible into the speech of common life. Such a translation might be sometimes a solitary experiment, or it might proceed from a generous wish to bring those who did not understand Latin face to face with the divine truth veiled in it. The Psalms, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer were in this way, and from time to time, rendered into the mother tongue, and those fragments appear to have been cherished as monastic treasures, or carefully kept as literary curiosities. Theodore of Tarsus, seventh Archbishop of Canterbury, on his first visitation, enjoined parents to see that "their children were taught to say the Creed and the Lord's Prayer in the vulgar tongue."² In the same spirit Bede writes to Egbert who had been recently raised to the primacy of York, exhorting him to cause the Lord's Prayer and the Creed to be turned into Anglo-Saxon for the use of the priesthood, as well as of the laity,³ and he appeals to his own example, for he had prepared such a translation for native teachers, ignorant of Latin. Aidan, the meek and pious Scottish Bishop of Lindisfarne (A.D. 635), who, according to Bede, "had a zeal of God" not quite according to knowledge, since he kept Easter according to the custom of his own country, employed all his associates, whether monks or laymen, in reading the Scriptures or in learning psalms.⁴ The state-

¹ So few Keltic words have been preserved, that they give no appreciable colouring to our language, except in names of localities, of which a considerable number survive. Morley's *English Writers*, vol. I, Pt. I, p. 163.

² Hook's *Archbishops of Canterbury*, Vol. I, p. 150. London, 1860.

³ Opera, vol. I, p. 14. Ed. Giles. "Even the mass itself was not entirely read in Latin. The

wedding form was no doubt in Anglo-Saxon, and its hearty sound and simple sterling substance are preserved in the English ritual to the present day." Lappenberg's *History of England under the Anglo-Saxons*, vol. I, p. 202. Thorpe's *Trans.*, London, 1845. *Palgrave's England and Normandy*, vol. II, p. cxxxvi.

⁴ Bede, Works, vol. II, p. 276. Ed. Giles, London, 1843.

ment seems to imply the existence and use of oral or written Northumbrian versions. Ussher records of Edfrid, of Lindisfarne (A.D. 710), that he translated most of the books of Scripture into Anglo-Saxon;¹ but the tradition lacks proof. Aldhelm, of Sherborne, in his treatise *De Laudibus Virginitatis*, praises some nuns for their earnest and continuous study of the Scriptures; and his eulogy seems to suggest that the sacred sisters possessed some portions of the Bible in their Anglo-Saxon or birth tongue.² The reading of Scripture was in those earlier times regarded as harmless, at least it was not frowned upon as perilous, for there was no popular restlessness under the established faith. Most of the older fragmentary Bibles have perished in the lapse of centuries, and in the destruction of the religious houses, when valuable libraries were dispersed as waste paper, or sold as fuel. The use of books, it is evident, must have been confined very much to the clergy, and the possession of them to the more wealthy and cultured of the laity. These early versions had no immediate bearing on the later English translations of the Bible, and therefore a history of them in merest outline only is sketched in the following pages; but as some readers may be interested in a brief account of the changes which at sundry times have passed over the old Saxon tongue, moulding in various ways the language of Cædmon and Alfred into that of Wycliffe and Tyndale, a very few remarks on these successive alterations have been given—all tending to prove that the first so-called Anglo-Saxon translation was as truly an English Bible as is the present Authorized Version of 1611.³

Now, the common and convenient epithet Anglo-Saxon, as applied to these native translations, though it may be rather apt to mislead, easily explains itself: its first part indicating those invaders who took possession of the country, and called it, after themselves, Engla-land, England; and the second part

¹ Ussher, Works, vol. XII, p. 282. Ed. Elrington, Dublin, 1847-64.

² Opera, p. 2. Ed. Giles, Oxon. 1844.

³ Research among Anglo-Saxon MSS. on the part of patient and skilled collators is yet greatly needed to give us their history, and a critical estimate of their age and value.

yet surviving in the names of separate provinces or kingdoms as Essex, Wessex, and Sussex. While there was only one settlement of Jutes, there were three settlements of Saxons, and four of Angles; and the Angles and the Saxons, from proximity of territory, were soon regarded as one people. Though the compound name is found in some old charters, the people called themselves and their tongue English.¹ This Anglo-Saxon² tongue was therefore our English tongue in its earlier and rougher form; and what Alfred called English³ has continued to be spoken in our land by successive generations for fourteen hundred years, and still lives in the power, character, and beauty of our modern language—gifts which have come to us by natural inheritance. Perhaps not much more than a fifth of its original vocabulary has fallen out of use, and though many changes have passed over it since the Norman conquest, it is yet read and relished in our present Bibles. In many sections of Scripture only about one word in forty is not Anglo-Saxon. Thus in Gen. xlii, 21-29, there are, with the exception

¹ Turner, *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, vol. I, p. 298. Bede speaks of five languages as spoken in the island; but two, if not three, of those referred to are merely dialects.

² The term, according to Lappenberg, occurs first in Paul Warnefrid (cap. vi, p. 15)—“*Ceodaldus rex Anglorum-Saxonum*.” See *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, vol. I, p. 97, &c., Thorpe’s Translation, and Freeman’s *Norman Conquest*, vol. I, p. 529, London. Ine, who began to reign A.D. 700, at the beginning of his laws is called King of the West Saxons, but in the Code itself his subjects are named *Englisc*, English, as opposed to *Wealh* or Welshmen, this term meaning foreigners or the ancient British. Saxon and Norman are not opposed as national epithets, and even at the period of the Conquest the terms are French and English,

and sometimes Normans and English. *Angli* was the common Latin name, though the people did not call themselves Angles, or their tongue Anglian, and even the Latin name is “English” in slight disguise. *Anglorum* is the epithet used in the title of Bede’s *History*, in the designation of the first Christian king, on the great seals of the Confessor and the Conqueror, while on the Bayeux tapestry Harold is called *Dux Anglorum*.

³ In the preface to his translation of Gregory’s *Pastoralis Regula*, he uses several times the term *Englisc* to denote his own language, and says that the name of Gregory’s book is in Latin *Pastoralis*, and in English *en Englisc hirde-boc*, herdsman’s book. Alfred’s Welsh biographer Asser calls it Saxon, as do still the Kelts both in England and Scotland.

of the proper names, only seven words which are not native; in the Parable of the Sower, Matt. xiii, 3-9, there are, out of 106 words employed, only three foreign ones; in John i, 1-10, only one Latin verb occurs; and in John xi, 27-46, there are not more than four or five non-English terms, with the same exception of proper names.

Some grammatical peculiarities of this Old English may be briefly noted, and many of them yet survive with more or less distinctness, as the names of objects of sense, of domestic relations, and of things of common life. If English word-books proper contain 38,000 words, then about five-eighths are Saxon, and the same average is true of the 10,000 terms in continual literary use. But in the 5,000 words of common living speech the small connective words which occur so frequently are Saxon, and the proportion is therefore greatly more than is to be found in dead dictionaries.¹

This ancestral tongue had two forms for the two sounds of *th*.² It spelled its relative with an initial and vocal *h*. Its monosyllabic particles are immortal—such as its articles, pronouns, auxiliary verbs, prepositions, and conjunctions. It had its seed within itself, and by simple inner changes, sometimes not unlike those of the Semitic dialects, it expressed new and varying shades of meaning, as may be still seen in our so-called defective and irregular verbs.³ Its noun had its

¹ Thommerel, *Recherches sur la fusion du Franco-Normand et de l’Anglosaxon*. Paris, 1841. Thommerel found in Richardson’s and Webster’s English Dictionaries 42,684 words, only 13,334 of them being of native origin, and 29,354 from a foreign source. But English dictionaries now contain an immense variety of technical terms, relating to trade, science, and art. In such collections, too, compound terms swell the list. Words compounded with the non-English particle “dis-” amount in Webster to 1,334, and the

like may be said of words into the composition of which enter *re-*, *com-*, *con-*, *inter-*, *sub-*, *ex-*, &c. The old tongue has lost its power of expansion and self-development, and the new words assumed into it are nearly all of classic birth. In Milton’s stock of 8,000 words there are, as might be expected, more than 5,000 of foreign origin, but in an actual and ordinary page of his poetry there are 80 per cent. of Saxon words.

² As “thin” and “thine.”

³ As in float, fleet; stud, steed; sop, sup; sing, song; wake, woke.

regular case-endings, which differed according to the gender of the word, and as the nominative ended in a vowel or a consonant;¹ and plurals were formed by the addition of -as, -is, -s, -n, -er, or by an internal vowel change.² Nouns often ended in syllables now represented by -hood, -head, -ship, -dom; diminutives in -ing, -kin -ock, -let; and gender was often marked by a different termination, as the feminine ending -ster or -in.³ Verbs were usually conjugated by strong preterites, which have an expressive force not found in the more recent and effeminate suffix of -ed; and they had both a common and a gerundial infinitive.⁴ The third person singular indicative and the plural indicative also ended in -th, &c.⁵ Numerous adverbs were formed from adjectives by the addition of "lic (-ly)," some were taken from verbs and nouns, and many are original monosyllables. Adjectives often ended in -ful, -less, -er. Many nouns were also used as adjectives, often with the addition of a syllable; and many verbs are also nouns, sometimes unaltered, and sometimes with the added syllable -an, or -ian. The Anglo-Saxon verb had no future form, and we now use the auxiliaries "shall" and "will"—"shall" being originally an expression of duty, and "will" of desire or purpose. In this way an Anglo-Saxon sentence was as firmly knitted together by the gender and cases of nouns and adjectives, and by the tenses and moods of verbs, as one in modern German. Compound words⁶ are

¹ The genitive in -s is still preserved in the 's of our possessive case, and in such words as twice, thrice, whose, towards; that in -an r -n in mine, thine; and the dative plural in -om lives in seldom, whom, &c.

² One form is found in the common English plural, and the others in such words as oxen, hosen, kine, child-er-en, geese, feet.

³ Darling, lambkin, hillock, hamlet, spinster, foster (foodster), vixen, carlin.

⁴ Ending in -enne or -aune, being a dative with "to" prefixed, as in

the phrases, "apt to teach," "I need money for to go."

⁵ Another verbal plural in -en is often found in Shakespeare, especially in the folio. Of this old form, which had begun to disappear after the time of Wycliffe, Ben Jonson says, "I am persuaded that the lack thereof will be found a great blemish to our tongue."

⁶ Some of these are very significant—Rhetoric being flyt-craeft, the art of flyting; Grammar, staef-craeft, the art of letters; Music, son-craeft, the art of sound; Arithmetic, rim-craft, the art of numbers,

numerous, expressive, and self-evident in meaning, and usually they are not hybrids. More especially in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, we have Godspel, good news, the gospel; reste-dæg, day of rest, or Sabbath; domes-dæg, domesday; big-spel, parable; tungel-witegan, star knowers, the magi; stoop-cild, step-child, or orphan (John xiv, 18); sunder-halgan, separate holy, the Pharisees; bocere, bookman, or scribe; leorning-cnicht, a disciple; wæter-seocman, one having dropsy; hundredes ealdor-man, a centurion; geriht-wisian, to justify; manfulle and synfulle, publicans and sinners. As was to be expected, Latin terms found their way from the Vulgate into the Anglo-Saxon New Testament, as sacerð, biscop, calic, martyr, &c.

FIRST PERIOD.

The earliest specimen of an effort to unseal the sacred volume is not a translation, but a paraphrastic poem, and it shows at least a willingness to present to the unlearned the truths and facts of Scripture. The poet did not feel that the sacred narrative suffered any degradation from being told in the familiar syllables of the hearth and the field. Towards the close of the seventh century, and in the time of St. Hilda, Cædmon,¹ originally a cow-herd, and afterwards a monk of Streaneshalch,² composed a metrical history of the Creation and the Exodus, the incarnation, death, resurrection, and ascension of the Saviour, the gift of the Spirit, and the solemn realities

folk-land being public land, and as, -citizen, -prisoners, -servant, boc-land, land in private possession. -soldier; and words compounded Agen-bite is remorse, as "Agen-bite of Inwit," remorse of conscience, with shcep—sheep-master, sheep-cote, &c.

¹ Edited by Junius (Francis Duyon), 1655; Thorpe, 1832; Grein, Göttingen, 1857; and Bouterwek, Elberfeld, 1849.

² Now known by its Danish name of Whitby. If not a cowherd, he had occasional charge of *jumenta* during night.

the name of Dan Michel's well known poem in the southern or Kentish dialect. Hunger-bitten survives in the Authorized Version (Job xviii, 12), as also do hand-breadth, hand-weapon, hand-writing, handy-work, a form found in Milton's "star ypointing pyramid"; child-bearing; words compounded with fellow,

of Eternity. Some sentences are rendered with considerable accuracy, and the poem shows the force and style of the current tongue of the period—a tongue somewhat rude but robust, like a wall built of rugged, unhewn stones, fresh from the quarry. As Cædmon could not himself translate, he only versified, with occasional felicity and glow, what others interpreted for him. Bede¹ speaks of his songs as composed with much sweetness and humility, and affirms that he was divinely helped, so that, having received the gift of poetry in a dream, he could never afterwards tune his cithard to any secular mirth.² The brethren taught him sacred history which, after meditation, he put into verses sometimes of Miltonic grandeur, and in turn made his teachers his hearers. Though Cædmon's poems are loose in their structure as being the rhythmic paraphrase of an oral version, and though they, in the course of transmission, have been altered and injured both in alliteration and sense, they are to be commended in their purpose, for they sprang from an earnest desire to impart sacred knowledge in a popular and memorable form.

About the same time a version of the Psalms is supposed to have been made by Guthlac,³ the earliest Saxon anchorite at Croyland. This version, or a similar one, is preserved between the lines of a very old Roman psalter, the MS. itself apparently written in Italy, and being as some suppose one of the books which Gregory sent to Augustine, Archbishop of Canterbury. This opinion is so far confirmed by the fact that while the Gallican psalter was used in the other parts of the island, the Roman psalter was read and sung in the Primate's own Cathedral.⁴ Aldhelm, allied to the royal blood, born in

¹ Bede wrote about sixty years after Cædmon's death. See Bouterwek, *De Cædmone poeta Anglo-Saxonum*, &c. Elberfeld, 1845.

² *Quasi mundum animal ruminando Bedæ opera*, vol. III, p. 116. Ed. Giles, London, 1843.

³ Died A.D. 714.

⁴ Baber, preface to Wycliffe, p. lviii. This venerable document is

still preserved among the Cottonian MSS., and was edited, in 1843, for the Surtees Society by J. Stevenson, "Anglo-Saxon and early English Psalter;" the volume also contains an early Northumbrian version. An Anglo-Saxon version of the life of Guthlac was edited from a MS. in the Cottonian collection, by E. H. Goodwin, London, 1848.

Wessex, and one of the earliest erudite clergy, first abbot of Malmesbury, and then Bishop of Sherborne, produced another Anglo-Saxon version of the Psalms about the year 706. This version has been identified with one found in the Royal Library at Paris at the beginning of this century. The first fifty psalms are in prose, and the rest in verse; but the whole translation, however, can scarcely be Aldhelm's.¹ Aldhelm had studied under the Abbot Adrian who had come over to England with Archbishop Theodore. Though he wrote so much in Latin, he was fond of his native tongue; and we are told on the authority of King Alfred, that when he was at Malmesbury, he composed songs in it, and sang them as a minstrel on a bridge frequented by the people, that they might, while they enjoyed his ballads, be inclined to listen as he introduced spiritual themes.

About a quarter of a century after this period the venerable Bede of Jarrow was engaged in the work of translation. The region in which this monastery was situated is now planted with a forest of furnaces, throwing out fire and smoke, and soiled with unsightly mounds of cinders and igneous refuse, while the din of heavy hammers is ever resounding, as great iron vessels are built in succession, by swart and busy myriads. But in Bede's time it was quiet, lone, and thinly peopled, and the Tyne ran through miles of solitary and monotonous moorland, with occasional patches of trees on its banks. Amidst his numerous literary toils—his History, Commentaries, and Controversial Tracts—Bede found time for rendering portions of the Scriptures into his mother tongue, and he had great delight in the occupation. While he appears to have had only some slight acquaintance with Hebrew,² he knew Greek, and

¹ Edited by Thorpe, *Liber Psalmorum, versio antiqua Latina, cum paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica*, &c. Oxon. 1835.

² The Tract, "De Interpretatione Nominum Hebraicorum," is not included in his own list of his thirty-eight works appended to his Ecclesiastical History, in A.D. 731. In his Tract *De Arte Metrica* he shows acquaintance with a metrical peculiarity of Homer, saying that it is to be used sparingly, that in Virgil it occurs non rarissimum, apud Homerum non frequentissimum. Opera, vol. VI, p. 6. Ed. Giles.

he had in his possession a Greek Codex of the Acts, to the readings of which he frequently refers in his Review¹ of his Commentary on that book. According to some of his biographers, Bede translated the whole Scripture; but the assertion is devoid of authority. There is, however, no doubt that he translated the Gospel of John, and that as the concluding verses were rendered by him he expired. The fourth Gospel in its pathos and subjectivity, its rich theology and profound spiritual experience, must have had a special charm for the holy and susceptible soul of Bede. His last task had been an English version of some extracts from Isidore, but the translation of the Gospel of John filled all his closing moments. It had been his study and delight, his spirit was in loving fellowship with Him whom it enshrines, and as he finished its translation he pillowed his dying head on the Lord's bosom and fell asleep.² The translator was revered in long subsequent times; and Purvey, the reviser of Wycliffe's version, looks back to him as a bright example and leader.³

During the next century the great and good King Alfred, as he surveyed and lamented the ravages of the Danish invasion, says, in the preface to his translation of the Pastoral of Pope Gregory, "I thought how I saw, before it was all spoiled and burned, how the churches were filled with treasures of books, and also with a great multitude of God's servants; yet they reaped very little fruit of these books, because they could

¹ Liber Retractationis in Acta Apostolorum. Opera, vol. XII, p. 96. Ed. Giles. Mill in his Prolegomena to his New Testament, p. 99, § 1022-26, collects some of the instances of agreement, and his conclusion is that Bede's MS. was either the Laudian Codex, *aut ejus plane gemellum*. Woide, in his Notitia Codicis Alexandrini, p. 156, &c., has adduced above thirty additional examples in proof. This Latin-Greek codex, now in the Bodleian Library, was probably brought into the country by

Archbishop Theodore. It was published by Hearne in 1715, and more recently by Tischendorf, Monumenta Sacra Inedita, vol. IX, Appendix.

² Died 27th May, 735 A.D., at the age of fifty-nine. The story of his end is told in a vivid letter of his pupil Cuthbert to his fellow-scholar Cuthwin.

³ "Bede translated the Bible, and expounded much in Saxon, that was English or common language of this land at his time."—Preface.

understand nothing of them, as they were not written in their own native tongue. Few persons south of the Humber could understand the service in English, or translate Latin into English. I think there were not many beyond the Humber, . . . and none to the south of the Thames, when I began to reign." Religious life had nearly died out; but it revived under him, and his patriotic valour kept his kingdom from relapsing into Pagan darkness and savagism through the inroads of the Danes, who were characteristically called the "heathen men,"—as wild followers of Odin, as Hengist and Horsa, and the early Saxon invaders. Alfred intimates also that he sometimes rendered word for word, and sometimes meaning for meaning.¹ To create a native literature, and infuse a taste for it, he translated many treatises as the histories of Orosius and Bede, Boëthius de Consolatione, and some of Augustine's Soliloquies; and crowned his labours by prefixing to his body of laws a translation of the Decalogue called "Alfred's Dooms," with portions of the three following chapters of Exodus, abridged and so altered that the fourth commandment reads, "for in six days Christ wrought the heavens and the earth." The extent of his Biblical labours has been greatly exaggerated; and Spelman, on the authority of Archbishop Parker, asserts that Alfred translated the New Testament, and some portion of the Old. At the time of his death (A.D. 901) he was engaged on a version of the Psalms; but the work was left incomplete. There lives, however, his patriotic wish that all the free-born youth of his kingdom should employ themselves on nothing till they were able to read well the English Scriptures. Such is at least the familiar form of quotation; but the last words, "Englisc ge-writ arædan," most probably mean simply, to read English writing, as indeed the context so plainly implies.²

Besides fragmentary versions of Scripture, glosses were also

¹ "Hwylum word be worde, hwylum andgit of andgite."—Preface to his translation of the "Pastoral," from the copy sent to Bishop Wulfsgige.

² Tyndale, in the preface to the

"Obedience of a Christian Man," says vaguely that "King Athelstane, exhorted by the bishops, caused the Holy Scripture to be translated into English." Foxe repeats the state-

in common use, the Latin text being accompanied by an interlinear vernacular translation.¹ One of these Evangelisteria, beautifully written, exists among the Cotton MSS. of the British Museum (Nero, D, iv)—sometimes called the Durham Book, as it belonged to the Dean and Chapter of Durham; and sometimes the Cuthbert Gospels, as the MS. is supposed to have been used by St. Cuthbert. It was adorned with gold, pictures, and precious jewels by Bishop Ethelwald and Bellfrith the anchorite, and it had quite a romantic history. The Latin of these four Gospels was written by Eadfrith, Bishop of Lindisfarne, about A.D. 680, and the Anglo-Saxon gloss was added by Aldred, a priest of Holy Isle, between the years 946 and 968, who calls himself "indignissimus et miserrimus." In the Bodleian Library there is another similar MS., of probably the same period—the Rushworth Gloss or Gospels, so named after its donor, the well known author of the voluminous "Historical Collections," relating to the period of the Commonwealth.² The book was written by an Irish scribe, MacRegol, and the interlinear version was inserted in the ninth or tenth century, the authors of it presenting their claim on those who

ment; but there is nothing to justify it.

¹Glossing was a very common practice at that period. The process was applied, not only to the Scriptures, but to other books, as Prosper, Prudentius, Sedulius, Dunstan's Rule for English Monks, &c. The gloss was neither a free nor yet a literal translation, but the interlinear insertion of the vernacular, word against word of the original, so that the order of the former was really irrespective of idiom and usage.

²The Gospels have been published by the Surtees Society—St. Matthew, in 1854, under the care of J. Stevenson; St. Mark, in 1861; St. Luke, in 1863; and St. John, in

1865—the three last edited by G. Waring. Four Saxon translations of the Gospel of St. Matthew were printed side by side in one volume, begun by Mr. Kemble and, after his death, finished by Mr. Hardwicke, Cambridge, 1858. One text is from a MS. in Corpus Christi College, the second text is from the Hatton MS. in the Bodleian, the third is the interlinear Lindisfarne gloss, and the fourth is the Rushworth version without its Latin text. The Gospel of St. Mark was published by the Rev. Walter Skeat, M.A., Cambridge, 1871, with an introduction of great interest and utility. Various readings are also given.

use it, to be remembered by them in prayer. "Farmen presbyter thas boc thus gleosed"—this book thus glossed; and the book ends with a prayer, "he that of mine profiteth, pray he for Owun that this book glossed, and Farmen, the priest at Harewood, who has now written the book." MacRegol also adds a prayer for himself. The Rushworth St. Matthew, which is not in the proper Northumbrian dialect, is rather an independent translation than a copied gloss; but the other three Gospels, with short exceptions, are transcripts of the Durham Book. Glosses of a similar nature were made on the Psalter: one of them, probably of the ninth century, was published by the younger Spelman in 1640. There are in existence other manuscript glosses, and their number shows that this form of presenting vernacular Scripture must have been a favourite labour of Biblical scribes and scholars; but such bilingual versions could not from their nature have had a very wide circulation. Among the forms of penance enjoined by St. Dunstan upon the unworthy King Edgar, is an injunction that he was to be at the expense of transcribing copies of the Holy Scriptures, and transmitting them to churches in various parts of the kingdom for the instruction of the people.

Ælfric, Abbot of Peterborough in 1004, and Archbishop of York¹ in 1023, translated large portions of Scripture, the greater part of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Kings, Esther, Job, Judith, and Maccabees. Ælfric translated with a patriotic purpose, and English is the name which he usually

¹According to many authorities, Grammarian was the Primate of not to be confounded with Ælfric, York; and he was replied to at length by Mores in a volume edited by Thorkelin, London, 1789. Leland made three Ælfrics, but Ussher united them into one. See also Norman's preface to his edition of the Anglo-Saxon version of the Hexameron of St. Basil, 2nd Ed., London, 1849; and Hook's Archbishops of Canterbury, vol. I, p. 439.

gives to his native speech.¹ Of his version of Joshua he says, "This book I turned into English for Ealdorman Ethelward, a book that a prince might study in times of invasion and turbulence." Of Judith he records, "Englished according to my skill, for your example, that you may also defend your country by force of arms against the outrage of foreign hosts." These translations are marked by abridgment and omissions.²

Thus the Anglo-Saxon Church had native versions and

¹ The versions of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Kings, and Esther were published, under the title of *Heptateuchus*, by Thwaites, Oxford, 1698. Ælfric also composed a brief account of the Old and New Testament; published by W. L'Isle, in 1623; and eighty of his Homilies have been published, under the editorial care of B. Thorpe, by a society which takes Ælfric's name.

From a MS. belonging to Archbishop Parker, which is still preserved in the Bodleian Library, were published, under the editorial care of John Foxe, "The Gospels of the fower Evangelistes translated in the Olde Saxon's tyme out of Latin into the vulgare tounge of the Saxons." London, 1571, printed by John Daye. The volume is printed in the same type as Ælfric's sermon on Easter-day, which was the first Anglo-Saxon book that issued from the English press, 1567. The Anglo-Saxon of the Gospels fills about two-thirds of the page, and the other third is occupied with the correspondent verses of the Bishops' Bible, which is now and then changed into harmony with the earlier version. It was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, and "given into her own hands by her Father Foxe." Marshall conjectures

that this book contained Bede's version of St. John's Gospel. An edition, based on that of 1571, was published by Junius the Younger and Marshall, London, 1638; and then in a more correct form, along with the Gothic version, Dordrecht, 1665; and Amsterdam, 1684. A small and useful edition of the Gospels appeared in 1842, edited by B. Thorpe, London and Oxford.

² A very accurate and complete edition of the Gospels was published, under the care of Bosworth and Waring, in 1865. It contains in parallel columns the Gothic version of Ulphilas, the first version of Wycliffe, and the first of Tyndale, 1526. For the Anglo-Saxon great pains were bestowed on a collation of the best MSS. In connection with this Polyglott may be commended—Helfenstein's Comparative Grammar of the Teutonic Languages, Macmillan & Co., 1870. Loth's *Etymologische Angelsächsische - englische Grammatik*, Elberfeld, 1870. March's *Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language*, &c., New York, 1871. Stratmann's *Dictionary of Old English*, Krefeld, 1867. Bosworth's *Origin of English*, &c., London, 1847.

glosses, though not in wide diffusion; but the wreck only of such treasures has come down to us. Many copies must have perished in the Danish invasion; and afterwards, through the neglect and contempt of the Norman nobility and ecclesiastics, Saxon manuscripts were often tossed aside as old and useless.¹ We have no proof that the ability to read had been generally acquired by the masses—and these extant volumes and all others which they represent—"what are they among so many?" But the men who translated Scripture into English syllables for Englishmen, felt that in this patriotic labour so far from unhallowing it, they were only giving it the greater glory of adaptation and living power, and they are to be honoured as national benefactors.

In a word, these Anglo-Saxon manuscripts² were all of necessity translated from the Latin; the era of Greek scholarship lay still in a remote futurity. The Latin version existed in two different forms—the familiar Vulgate, as partly revised and partly translated by Jerome, and the prior old version, often named the *Vetus Itala*, which is found in the Latin of the *Codex Bezae*—D of the Gospels and Acts;³ in the *Codex Palatinus* recently edited by Tischendorf⁴; and on the left-hand page of Blanchini's *Evangelium Quadruplex*. From this Ante-Hieronymian version some of the Anglo-Saxon renderings were taken. It is followed where the Vulgate differs from it, in Matt. xxiii, 14, a verse being omitted which the Vulgate has; and Matt. xx, 28, the old Latin having an addition of some verses chiefly taken from Luke xiv, 7-10. On the other hand, the Anglo-Saxon version often agrees, not with the Clementine text, but with the best readings of the Vulgate as preserved in the *Codex Amiatinus*.

¹ Thus in Wanley's Introduction to a catalogue made in A.D. 1248, of Saxon books in the library at Glas-

tonbury, this entry appears—*duo Anglica, vetusta et inutilia*. ² This Codex, presented to Cambridge by Beza, was edited by Dr. Scrivener, in 1864.

³ Both Mill and Tischendorf refer

⁴ Lipsiæ, 1847.

SECOND PERIOD.

Scandinavian pirates had ravaged the northern shores of France for several years, when Jarl Oscar, in May, 841, sailed up the Seine and plundered Rouen. The same process was repeated by the sea king Ragnar Lodbrog and his lawless followers within a brief period. These successes brought another band which in 876, under Rolf or Duke Rollo,¹ a Norwegian rover, conquered and took possession of Neustria, which at length was formally ceded in 912 to the victorious invaders by Charles the Simple. The descendants of these Northmen or Normans soon came to speak the tongue of the people among whom they dwelt, for the warriors took native wives, who were not pure Kelts, but had a large admixture of Roman and Frankish blood. The children naturally used the speech of their mothers. Scandinavian manners and dress were abandoned as well as the Scandinavian tongue, so that, a few years after the death of Duke Rollo, William (Longsword), the second duke, was obliged to send his son to Bayeux² to learn Danish, as the *Langue Romane*³ was almost the only dialect spoken in his capital city of Rouen. At the council of Mouson-sur-Meuse in 995, the Bishop of Verdun spoke in French. When, under the seventh Duke William, the illegitimate son of Robert the Devil, these Normans invaded England scarcely two centuries after their settlement in France, they brought with them their new language.

But French was not introduced into the island by the conquerors; for, in fact, French influence had been at work in

¹ Or Rou, as in Wace's poem, in the south of France the form Roman de Rou. Rolf (Hwrolf) followed the example of his old ally Guthrun, whom he had helped to ravage the English coast, and was baptized.

² Dudo de St. Quentin, lib. iii, p. 112. Bayeux and its territory, the Bessin, had enjoyed at least a double infusion of Teutonic blood.

³ This *Langue Romane* assumed

in the south of France the form known as the Provençal or *Langue-d'Oc*, and that in the north became *Langue-d'Oyl*, the progenitor of modern French; *Oc* and *Oyl* (*oui*) being the different ways of making affirmation. Useful information on the Romance languages will be found in Essays on their "Origin and Formation" by Sir George Cornwall Lewis, London, 1862, 2nd edition.

England for a considerable time. Cnut,¹ the Danish king, had married the widow of Æthelred, Emma, the "gem of the Normans"; and children were often sent out of England to be educated in French monasteries. Edward, the last king of the old line, was the son of a Norman princess, and cousin of Duke William who put forward a claim to the throne of England, based on his childless kinsman's promise. Called to the throne as an Atheling, or a descendant of the royal house of Cerdic, at the death of Harthacnut, third and last of the Danish kings, the Confessor, who had been educated in Normandy, brought the French language into his court, and surrounded himself with Norman ecclesiastics and officers. Important fortresses on the Welsh borders were occupied by foreign soldiers, and, under royal encouragement, many Normans had planted themselves in the cities as merchants. Robert of Jumiege held the primacy of Canterbury; and a faction of the king's French favourites was able, in 1051, to drive Godwin, the great Earl of the West Saxons, out of the kingdom for a time.

The defeat of Harold, on the hill of Senlac behind Hastings, introduced a great and terrible revolution. In the general confiscation, the English secular clergy and not a few mitred dignitaries were gradually set aside; the domains of the higher classes were abruptly torn from the most of them, the others being forced to hold their property by a new tenure as vassals, nay, some of them became socagers, or sank into villeins.² The more daring spirits rose in revolt like Hereward, adventurous bands wandered as far as Constantinople and entered the famous Varangian guards, and a fraction of the more reckless, of whom Robin Hood is the popular representative, fled in a spirit of wild revenge to the shelter of the forests, and lived as outlaws and robbers.

It was natural for the victorious Norman nobility and their retainers to cherish their own dialect and disparage that of the humbled and beaten islanders. Lanfranc, who had been trans-

¹ Latinized into Canutus by Pope Paschal II, who could not pronounce the thick Scandinavian monosyllable.

² History of the Norman Kings of England, by Thomas Cobbe, Barrister of the Inner Temple, &c., p. 43, London, 1869.

lated to Canterbury, scorned the native saints; and, under him, the Abbot Paul threw down the tombs of his English predecessors in the abbey of St. Albans. But, while French influence so proudly predominated at the court, in towns, and wherever the Norman grandees in the church, the state, and the army had sway, the people clung to their own speech. The situation favoured the success of this popular conservatism. The lower classes, serfs, herdsmen, tillers of the earth, "hewers of wood and drawers of water," suffered little by the Conquest. What befell them was simply a change of masters. They lived on the soil as in former times, and were contented to speak the tongue which their fathers had spoken before them. Besides, the conquerors were only a small minority, originally an army of sixty thousand now dispersed among two millions, so that they could not colonize the country, or mingle largely with the native race. Many of the victorious strangers coveted comparative isolation by fortifying themselves in castles—eleven hundred of which were built in the reign of Stephen. The government was, in fact, a military occupation, which had displaced the nobility and gentry—introduced a new dynasty and a foreign aristocracy. The immediate result was that two languages were spoken side by side, French and English, the former by the governing faction, and the latter by the masses of the people, thousands of whom could have little personal intercourse with the knights and barons of the Conqueror.¹ There occurred in this way the phenomenon described by Robert of Gloucester in his metrical Chronicle, belonging to the latter half of the thirteenth century—"The Normans spoke French and taught it to their children, and the high men of the land did the same, whereas, low men held to English and their natural speech yet; it is advantageous to know both."² Trevisa, in his translation of Higden's Polychronicon,³ laments that against

¹ Palgrave's Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth, vol. I, p. 56. King William, immediately after the Conquest, gave an English charter to the city of London.

² Hearne's edition, p. 364.

³ Vol. II, p. 9, Rolls edition. See introduction to the Rolls edition of Higden. Ed. Churchill Babington, B.D., F.L.S., &c., Cambridge, vol. I, London, 1865. Ranulph Higden was a Benedictine monk of

the manners and usage of all other nations, children at school had to leave their own tongue, and "construe lessons and thinges in French," ever since the Normans came first into England; and that "uplandish people" who would be gentlemen, were making great efforts to master French.

There is no proof whatever of the common accusation that William forbade the use of English¹ to the people, though he enacted that French should be spoken in seats of learning. On the other hand, he tried to master English himself, but at the age of forty-three he found the task too hard and irksome for him.² His purpose was to understand the causes brought before him for judgment, and these must have been presented in English. What was impossible to the father was apparently achieved in part by two of his sons. William Rufus gained the help of a portion of his subjects against some Norman rebels in the midst of them, by addressing to them some pithy English words. Henry I (Beauclerc), the Conqueror's youngest son, seems to have been taught English, as he was born in the country, and got the education of an English prince, the son of a crowned king; and he was sometimes left in England when his father and brothers went to Normandy. He is said to have translated Æsop's Fables³ into English. But French was the tongue of

St. Werburgh's Abbey, Chester. The Polychronicon is a universal history, brought down to the year 1342. But the manuscripts somewhat vary as to the date of termination.

¹ Palgrave's England and Normandy, vol. III, p. 627. Thus Thorpe asserts that "William and his fawning courtiers tried in vain to thrust their French into the mouths of the English people."—*Analecta Saxonica*, Preface, p. 5. Hume writes that William had even entertained the difficult project of totally abolishing the English language, but adds, what his own style contradicts, "that the mixture of French introduced by William is the

greatest and best part of our language."—History, vol. I, p. 259, London, 1825. See also Henry, History, vol. VI, p. 319, London, 1814.

² Odericus Vitalis (*Ecclesiast. Hist.*, lib. iv, cap. 7) gives, as the cause of his failure, *durior aetas et tumultus multimodarum occupationum*.

³ The authority for the statement is Mary of France, who translated the English Fables into French—

De Griu en Latin le turna
Li rois Henris, qui moult l'ama,
Le translata puis en Engleiz.

Freeman's Norman Conquest, vol. IV, p. 792.

the court and the aristocracy, and the medium of intercourse in universities. There was also a close connection with the continent for many reigns.¹ Kings of England married French wives. Stephen wedded a daughter of the Count of Boulogne; Maud, Stephen's rival, chose a Plantagenet, Earl of Anjou; Henry the Second espoused Eleanor of Aquitaine, the divorced wife of Louis the Seventh, and by her obtained large possessions, in addition to Touraine and Anjou, which he held from his father.² Richard the First married a daughter of the king of Navarre; John, a daughter of the Count of Angoulême; and Henry the Third, a daughter of the Count of Provence. The second wife of Edward the First was a sister of the King of France; and Edward's son married Isabella, daughter of the French monarch. A single sentence of English is ascribed to Richard I; his chancellor, however, avers that he was wholly ignorant of the island tongue; he was, in fact, a true Provençal poet.

But there had been an incipient coalition of races going on for a considerable time—even while distinction of language remained. The author of the "Dialogue on the Exchequer"—who mentions that he began this work in A.D. 1177, and asserts that he had seen Chief Justice Robert, Earl of Leicester, in 1168, and conversed with Robert of Blois, Bishop of Winchester, who died in 1171—records of his own knowledge, "already by English and Normans cohabiting and taking wives from each other, the nations are so thoroughly mixed that at this day it can hardly be discovered (I speak of the children) which is of England and which is of Norman race, excepting those who are bound to the soil, and who are called

¹ Henry married Edith, the daughter of the Scottish Queen Margaret, the sister of the Atheling Edgar, her name being changed into Matilda. She had been trained by her English mother in the palatial Abbey of Dunfermline, and was loved as the "good" Queen Maud. The king, from his English likings and his use of English speech, was sneered at by the Normans as Gaffer Goodrich, his queen being called Cummer Godgifu.

² "It was not the Englishman who reigned over Anjou, but the Angevine who reigned over England." Freeman's *Historical Essays*, p. 194.

villeins."¹ In Magna Charta no mention is made of different races, the nation is regarded as a homogeneous unity, and this—149 years after the conquest. In the reign of King John, Normandy, which had been held for four centuries by the House of Rolf the Ganger, was lost, and one result was that this island became more and more a home to the Normans, and French became more and more of a foreign tongue to them. English had not only survived, but was spreading itself through the upper classes. Norman children could not be kept from learning it; and the higher ranks, being a minority, felt the necessity of acquiring it.² By the end of the thirteenth century English seems to have become the mother tongue of the aristocracy; their children being taught French as a foreign language, and as an accomplishment befitting their rank.

Thus all the while the English tongue had preserved itself, and even asserted its national pre-eminence. Of this wondrous vitality there was a remarkable proof and example when, in 1258, Henry III, in the forty-second year of his reign, issued in the form of letters patent a Proclamation in French and English,³ the first language for the nobility and the second for the body of the people. This is the first specimen of popular English since the Conquest; and the "folk" must have felt that such appeal to them in their own tongue betokened the dawning of a new era.

Mandeville in his preface to his *Travels*, published in 1356, says that he wrote his book first in Latin which he rendered into French, and then translated it "out of Frensche into Englysch, that every man of my nacion may understand it." In 1362 an Act of Parliament, itself written in French, ordained that all pleadings in courts of law should be in

¹ This work, *Dialogus de Scaccario*, has been ascribed to Gervase of Tilbury, and to Richard, Bishop of London.

² Preface to Wright's edition of the *Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft*, p. xxvii. A knight, named Walter

de Billesworth, compiled a treatise for teaching French to the children of the nobility, the French text of the work being accompanied with an interlinear English gloss.

³ Edited by Alex. J. Ellis, *Philological Society*. Asher & Co., London.

English, as suitors no longer knew French. In the same year the first king's speech was delivered to the representatives of the people in English; but the first statutes recorded and printed in English are those of Richard III, though they were entered on the Rolls of Parliament in French.¹ Pierre de Langtoft wrote his Chronicle² in French; but in a brief space he appears as Peter Langtoft in Brunne's English Translation. Edward III commonly used French, but in 1346 he rebuked "such as would wish to blot out the English tongue"; and in 1349 he appeared at a tournament with an English legend on his shield. Froissart notes as singular the knowledge of French possessed by his grandson, Richard II, who spoke to the rebels under Wat Tyler in their birth tongue, and easily pacified them. Gower, who wrote the last work in French of any importance—*Speculum Meditantis*—virtually apologizes for writing in that tongue; and in his preface to his English poem, written at the request of King Richard—the *Confessio Amantis*³—though he styles himself a "borel clerke," he professes to set an example by writing in "oure Englysshe." Trevisa,⁴ in 1387, remarking on the change that had taken place in the relative position of the two languages, says, in his own quaint way, "that the old custom had been reversed in a great measure through the effort of John Cornwaile, maister of gramer," so that now, "in the year of our Lord 1385, in all the gramer scholes of England children leaveth Frensch and construeth and learneth English"—the advantage being that pupils make speedy progress, and

¹ Rymer mentions an English statute of 1368, and there is an English contract connected with the Convent of Whitby of 1343.

² See Preface to Wright's edition of the Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft.

³ Printed by Caxton, 1493, and edited by Pauli, London, 1857.

⁴ Trevisa, a native of Cornwall, and fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, translated Higden's *Polychronicon* out of Latin into Eng-

lish, and finished his translation, as he intimates himself, on Thursday, the 18th of April, 1387. It was written at the request of Lord Berkeley, and dedicated to him in an epistle beginning thus—"I, John Trevisa, your prieste and bedeman, obedyent and buxom, to worke your wylle." It was printed by Caxton in 1482, but "he somewhat chaunged the rude and Old Englysch." Trevisa's name will occur again in the next chapter.

the disadvantage being that ignorance of French becomes a great bar to travel in foreign countries. But French itself had suffered by its transplantation into England, and Chaucer ridicules the French learned by young ladies at school.¹ The same poet also counsels, "Let clerkes endyten in Latyn . . . and Frenchmen in their French also endyte theyr quaint termes, for it is kyndly to theyr mouths, and let us show our fantasies in such wordes as we learneden of our dames' tonge."

Though the language was still the old English tongue, it came out of all this turmoil and conflict wondrously transfigured. It once had a homogeneous vocabulary, but foreign words had now crept into it; and it had a synthetic structure, but its precise and self-adjusting syntax had passed out of use. It was, however, touched in structure before its substance was added to. In the proclamation of Henry III, already referred to, there are but two foreign words—terms of rank or office—Duke and Marshall. In the 5,700 lines of the two texts of Layamon's *Brut*, though it was translated from French and Latin, there are not more than a hundred words of Latin or Norman origin. Out of 2,300 words of the *Ormulum*, not more than sixty are foreign, and of these, ten are from Latin and not one from Norman. In Mandeville's Prologue of 1,200 words, only 130 are of Latin origin, and thirty of them are new. Several words of his coinage have kept their place.² In many of the authors of the thirteenth century the new words do not amount to more than five per cent. According to Coleridge's *Glossarial Index*, the entire stock of words in literary use in the same century amounted to 8,000, and only about 1,000 of them are of Latin or Romance origin. About Chaucer's period, English began to receive many additions to its stock.³

¹ And French she spake full fayre
and fetisly,
After the scole of Stratford atte
Bow,
For French of Paris was to her
unknowe.

² As abstain, abundant, cause, calculate, contrary, convenient, dis-

cover, faithful, inspiration, obstacle, quantity, temporal, testament, subjection.

³ The Danes had neither an acknowledged grammar nor any literature, and there was an antipathy in Norse or Danish to final syllables employed to mark cases and conju-

But English is not in the strict sense a composite language, nor is it the mere result of the fusion of Saxon or Norman; for its grammar in its essential elements is Saxon, modified in many ways and simplified, all its auxiliary verbs and its particles, "the bolts, pins, and hinges," being of native origin. But what is first apparent after the Norman Conquest is not so much the introduction of new terms as the destruction of the numerous inflectional terminations of the older Saxon tongue, a change which might to some extent have passed over it in course of time though the Conquest had never taken place. A similar change was at that period passing over the other dialects of Germanic stock; for such disintegration is inherent in language and was becoming apparent before the year 1066. Price,¹ Guest,² Hallam and others make this innate tendency the sole cause of the linguistic revolution in England. The statement is as extreme as the other theory, which supposes that the Norman Conquest, merely by the inbringing of another dialect, effected the decomposition of the older tongue. But the Norman Conquest wrought in this way: it broke up that form of civilization to which the Anglo-Saxon speech belonged as its creation and representative. The social changes were extreme and irresistible, and they swept the upper ranks into universal ruin.³ Books could have no charms for the churls

gations. This influence had been felt during three reigns, and the Danelagh comprised the larger portion of Mercia, Northumberland, and East Anglia. The reader will find admirable lists of native and foreign terms in the "Historical Outlines of English Accidence," pp. 35 and 377, by Richard Morris, LL.D., London, 1873. Dr. Morris shows that foreign terms are more numerous than they are sometimes alleged to be, there being in the *Ancren Riwele*, 428, and in Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle, 570.

¹ Preface to Warton's *History of English Poetry*, pp. 85, 86, &c.

² *English Rhythms*, vol. II, p. 105. See also Murray's *History of European Languages*. Craik's *History of English Literature*, &c., vol. I, p. 150. Yet Icelandic has remained unchanged for seven centuries.

³ Ordericus Vitalis, lib. iv, p. 323. Thierry's *History of the Norman conquest*, Vol. I, p. 193, Bohn. Twenty years after the Conquest, when William in 1086, summoned his great council at Salisbury, there was not one English earl, and only one English bishop, to respond to the summons. The ecclesiastics were more rancorous in

and villeins who were thrust unceremoniously under a foreign yoke. Many of the best born ladies became the prey "par marriage," or "par amours," of the lowest of the Bastard's followers. "Ignoble grooms did as they pleased with the noblest women, and left them nothing but to weep and wish for death."¹

This sweeping territorial revolution broke the spirit of the people, chilled free thought and culture, destroyed all impulse to write in the native tongue and all pride in preserving its purity. The result of this abrupt and violent cessation of Anglo-Saxon literature² was, that the language, left to itself as simply a spoken language, began to alter and work itself free from its more exact grammatical intricacies. Probably the people never spoke the older tongue as it was written in books; and their freer speech, unchecked by any literary models or contrasts, and in the absence or displacement of the educated thanes or gentry, came to be at length the prevailing tongue. Normans and Saxons were of necessity obliged to make themselves understood to one another, and both were naturally content to use a few words of the other's vocabulary without any great regard to the grammar on either side. Prior to the Conquest care had been taken in literary composition of terminations indicating gender and case, number and tense, and of other minute and elaborate

their hostility than the soldiers. Stigand was deposed from the primacy to make way for Lanfranc, who is said also to have seized many copies of the Scripture and corrected them with his own hand, on the pretence that the Saxon scribes had corrupted them.

¹ As a specimen of the displacement of native proprietors, it may be mentioned that 60,000 knights' fees were established by the Conqueror, that the crown lands were made up of more than 1,400 manors, one of the Conqueror's brothers

being put in possession of over 800 in nineteen counties, and another having nearly 500 in seventeen counties; and hundreds were possessed by other favourites—all lands of the nation, both of tenants in capite and their sub-tenants, being at the same time vested in William as supreme Over-Lord.

² The Saxon Chronicle itself ceased about a century after the Conquest, 1154. Edited by Edmund Gibson, A.B., e Collegio Regiæ, Oxonii, 1692; and more recently by B. Thorpe, Rolls edition.

peculiarities; but such niceties were so embarrassing in conversation, that they soon came to be slipped over and finally put aside. So that what happened to the Greek language after the fall of Constantinople, and to the Latin after the overthrow of the Empire, happened in a similar way to the tongue of the Saxon races in these islands after Duke William's invasion.¹

In the times after the Conquest the article *se, seo, thæt*, with its five cases, lost the first two forms, and finally passed into the simple indeclinable definite article. The conventional genders and the declensions of nouns faded away; the cases, with the exception of the -s of the genitive, sank out of view; relations were expressed by prepositions; and the "e" that marked the dative became first silent, as in Wycliffe, and then was dropped. When the earlier terminations were all merged in -e, person, case, number, and tense soon ceased to be individually represented. Adjectives lost all distinction of number, gender, and case; the interrogative and relative, retaining only a genitive and accusative, became the same in singular and plural; whereas the demonstratives "this" and "that," while they preserved a plural form, lost all difference of case. The plural endings in -a, -e, -en, save in a few words, were superseded by the Norman termination "-s." Adjectives which, as in modern German, had declensions and grammatical genders, passed through the same changes as the nouns. The dual of the pronoun grew obsolete; and "heo," feminine of "he," was altered into "she." Many strong preterites became weak; conjugations were formed by means of auxiliaries; the infinitive, which had ended in -an or -en, first losing the -n, prefixed "to," and latterly "for to"; the third person singular, being still found in the "-eth" of the old

¹ Some of the gradual changes from indolence, as man has an may be seen by comparing the second column of Skeat's Anglo-Saxon Mark "instinctive disposition to seek relief from" the effort to articulate, with the earlier text in the one by its side. See also his Preface, p. xxvii. or to do it with the least possible trouble. Language and the Study Prof. Whitney justly remarks that of Language, p. 195, New York, such vocal changes proceed usually 1872.

and the Biblical English, while "-ath" of the plural, which Norman lips "could not frame to pronounce," disappeared, and -en for a while took its place. The participle was no longer declined. Participial and infinitival endings were confounded, and the gerundial infinitive crumbled away. Both modes of comparison have however been preserved—the Anglo-Saxon by "-er," "-est," and an imitation of Norman by "more" and "most." The Norman preposition "de" with the genitive was not adopted, the Anglo-Saxon "of" was accepted, and the -s was also retained. One regrets that the plural "-en" of verbs has been lost, and indeed Spenser was unable to preserve it. One is sorry too that -s, with its hissing sound, should so often occur; for it has superseded not only the -eth of the third person singular, but also the old plural termination of nouns and verbs, while at the same time there are many words ending in -ess. In Anglo-Saxon the plural of masculine nouns only ended in -s; but, with few exceptions, all plurals in French were so formed, and the terminations passed into English.¹ Special feminine forms, like -ster (spinster), have come to end in -ess, or are retained as exceptional.²

Such is a brief and imperfect sketch of the gradual alterations which passed over the old Anglo-Saxon during two centuries and a half, when our modern English was "in making." Though the process lopped off many branchlets and twigs, it left the living trunk which soon renewed its youth, and putting forth fresh vigour and beauty, formed a national

¹ In Jeremy Taylor's famous image of the lark, there are eleven sibilants in the first thirty-one words.

² The Priest Layamon's Brut or Chronicle of Britain, written before A.D. 1200, is a translation of the Norman Wace's Brut, and was edited by Sir Frederick Madden, London, 1847. It is in the dialect of North Worcestershire, and marks a period of transition when the written language had been loosened by the spoken tongue. Infinitives

have "to" prefixed, weak tenses are introduced, "a" is used as an article, genders and inflections are not carefully observed, -en supersedes -on in the plural of verbs. Similar transitional style is found, with some variations, in Havelok, and in Piers Ploughman, the Ancren Riwele (Anchoresses' Rule), edited by Morton, 1853, and a later poem, the Harrowing (harrying) of Hell. See Dr. Angus's Handbook of the English Tongue, London, 1869.

tongue in which Wycliffe was able at length to give an English Bible to the English people. In fine, it was surely natural that the early English tongue, in spite of exotic additions and changes in spelling and structure, should cling to an Englishman throughout his national history, and that to it should belong the terms which tell what he sees above him and around him, in fruits, flowers, and seasons, which describe his own physical organs and his inner emotions, the weapons he wields, the tools he handles, the products of his handywork, and the animals about him in pasture and tillage, and which name the close and familiar relations of life, his heart and his home, and his surroundings from birth to death.

In this old tongue, which some in its first shape have called Anglo-Norman or early English, we have a Psalter in prose, with the Canticles of the Church, before the year 1200, and a prose translation of a large portion of the Bible before 1360. Among these early translations one is distinguished as the *Ormulum*,¹ after its author Orm or Ormin, a canon of the Order of St. Augustine, and is probably of northern origin. He dedicates² to his brother his poem, which is a versified paraphrase of the Gospels and Acts in the style of Latin tetrameter iambs, and consists of 20,000 lines. Though it is a specimen of the tongue of the time of Henry II, the older case endings have almost disappeared. About his orthography the author is very careful, and forewarns all transcribers to maintain literal accuracy, as if he had felt that the English of his day needed a special and intelligent guardianship, that amidst growing changes it might not degenerate. A similar

¹ The author himself intimates, "This book is named *Ormulum*, for that Orm it wrought (made)." The *Ormulum* was edited from MSS. in the Bodleian, with a glossary and notes, by Robert Meadows White, D.D. Two vols., Oxford, 1852.

² In the dedication to his brother, he says—

Icc hafe wennd inntill Ennglissh,
Goddspelless hallghe lore.
I have turned into English
Gospel's holy lore.
He spells with a single consonant
after a vowel which has its name
sound, but doubles the consonant
after a vowel otherwise pronounced,
as we similarly do in such forms as
tale, tall, mute, dull.

work—"Story of Genesis and Exodus"—is preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge;¹ and in the Bodleian at Oxford is a long poem called *Salus Animi* (Sowle-hele), soul-health, a diffuse paraphrastic version of Scripture. There is also a Psalter in verse, dated at the conclusion of the thirteenth century, which is fairly translated, and is characterized by its expressive simplicity; and as six copies are still extant, it must have enjoyed some circulation. There exists a prose translation of the Psalms into this old English, by William de Schorham,² who in 1320 became vicar of Chart-Sutton, in Kent. The Latin and English are verse for verse, and the version in the southern dialect is remarkably good.³ A manuscript of a Psalter of the fourteenth century, giving the name of John Hyde as its owner, and lying in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, appears to be a revised edition of Schorham. Numerous copies, either fragmentary or complete, exist of another version, in the northern dialect, of the Psalms, made by Richard Rolle, Chantry priest of Hampole, near Doncaster, and often called the Hermit of Hampole. He seems to have been a recluse of the Order of St. Augustine, and he died in 1349 in the odour of sanctity. According to Baber, "his life was devotion, and his amusement study." Having written a Latin commentary on the Psalms, he afterwards translated them into English with an English commentary. The existing manuscripts vary much—the commentary in some is very short, and in others is of undue length; but the preface is the same in all. The shorter commentary probably represents the original form, and the number of the existing copies and the frequent revisions show that the work must have had a considerable circulation. The spelling and language have been retouched from time to time. Prefixed to a copy in the Bodleian Library are some verses of a later age, which describe the origin of the work, and this MS. is probably of the period of Henry VI. The writer asserts that the version was made at

¹ Edited by Richard Morris, London, 1865.

² He adopts in the 1st verse of Psalm i, the reading or gloss *judicio falsitatis* instead of *cathedra ptilentia*.
tion to Wycliffe, p. iii.

the request of Dame Margaret Kirkby, and that the original copy was still kept in the nunnery, chained to Hampole's tomb, but adds

"Coppied has this Sauter been of yvil men of Lollardry.
And afturwards hit has bene sene ympyd in with eresy."

Hampole thus describes his own procedure: "In this werke I seke no strange ynglys, but lightest and comunest, and swilk is most like unto the Latyne, so that thai that knowes noght the Latyne be the ynglys may come to many Latin wordis. In the translacion I feloghe the letter als-mekille as I may, &c."

It was very natural that the Gospels should be so often selected for translation and for glossing, and indeed the very name of the Saviour as Hælend (Healer) must have come home with a thrill to many souls, on which the stately Latin terms could make no impression; for the Healer had delivered from all maladies, had revealed the Divine Fatherhood, and lifted the burden from broken hearts, binding up their wounds, and filling them with power and life. But the favourite portion of Scripture first selected for translation in these times as in all times, was the Psalms, and one can scarcely wonder at the preference; for this Hebrew anthology contains hymns of earnest aspiration, thanksgiving, and self-communing, in which the devout spirit finds a second self. The melody of the Psalmist has many moods, but the song is ever the genuine outburst of his heart, and the reader is lured into living sympathy with it—nay, as it throbs underneath the page, he is brought into immediate fellowship with the singer, and not with his shadow. For himself, in his various changes, is embodied in his Psalms, whether he sinks in deep contrition or soars away in spiritual rapture, whether he extols mercy or sinks into awe before judgment, or whether he lays his sword and sceptre at the foot of the Throne in offer of suit and service or in acknowledgment that the kingdom and the victory are alike from God. The Psalter is the poetry of the spiritual life; its beauty, power, and freshness never fail, for it does not consist of abstract and impersonal effusions, or of objective

theological dogmas. Difference of age and country at once fades away. In the sorrows of this representative bard many a soul has seen its own, and has felt the load lightened by its share in his recorded consolations; while his loftier strains so glide in to the "merry heart" that it sings them without any sense of strangeness, without any consciousness of formal appropriation. Therefore the Psalms have always been very cherished companions, not simply because they are a body of divine truth bearing on man's highest interests, but because they come home to human experiences and tenderly touch them on so many points, because they are not only the true elements of public worship, but may also be murmured in earnest soliloquy as the spirit in confidence and joyousness lifts itself to God. Many of these lyrics also bear a national character, and, in those old days of constant battle and frequent disaster, they must often have inspired courage, hope, and renewed trust in Him who is King of all people, and the Lord of armies. Though they sometimes present in mournful tones the wanton desolation brought in by a foreign foe, they at the same time pour comfort into the ear of the forlorn daughter of Zion, covered with sackcloth and sitting in the dust. So that their peculiar adaptation to the numerous national changes and adversities of these early periods was often felt; and they must have revived many saintly, and cheered many patriotic mourners.

We know not how far Anglo-Saxon or Old English literature, common or Biblical, spread into Scotland. In 547, Ida established himself with a band of Angles in Northumberland, or rather in the old British province of Bernicia of which Bamborough was the capital. This territory of Bernicia soon extended through the country between the Tweed and the Forth which was then called the "Scots' water," Scotland proper lying to the north of it. One of the kings gave his name to a town and castle lying at the northern extremity of his dominion—Edwin-burgh—Edinburgh. About the middle of the tenth century the Lothians were formally given over to Kenneth by Edgar and his Witan on condition that the inhabitants should be allowed their laws, language, and

customs. As Anglo-Saxon literature was earnestly cultivated in the north of England which possessed the flourishing monasteries of Jarrow, Wearmouth, and Hexham, and as the Christianity of Northumberland had a close connection with Iona, it is more than probable that some copies of Scripture would find their way across the border, and in that language which has kept its hold on the Lowlands, and yet survives so fully in the people's tongue. Norman settlers formed also in the course of time a distinct and important element of the Scottish population.¹ The changes that passed over the Anglo-Saxon tongue in England must have been felt also in Scotland; but no specimen survives save in the popular dialect.² The King of Scots sometimes reigned over all the inhabitants, but the Scots proper, and their tongue, the Gaelic, is yet far from being extinct.³

¹ The king's writs, about the time of William the Lion, were addressed to Franks and Angles, Scots and Galwegians. A coin of William of Scotland, in 1165, bears on it a French inscription. Alexander III, in 1249, took the coronation oath in Latin and in French. Wallace, Bruce, Comyn, Baliol, and the Stewarts, were of Norman lineage.

² Interesting information may be found in Murray's "Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland." Transactions of the Philological Society, 1870, part II, London, 1873. The Scots came originally from Ireland, and brought their

name and language with them. In the time of James VI, the islanders of the Hebrides are called Irishmen in an Act of Parliament of 1593, and in an Act of the General Assembly of the Kirk, 1717, Gaelic is called Irish, the commoner form being Erse.

³ So that the words of the old Latin hymn of Bothe, Archbishop of York (1476), are still true to some extent—

"In cunctis planis Anglorum
lingua choruscat,
Ast in montanis barbara Scota
sonat."

WYCLIFFE.

Then from the dawn it seemed there came, but faint,
As from beyond the limit of the world,
Like the last echo born of a great cry,
Sounds, as if some fair city were one voice
Around a king returning from his wars.
Thereat once more he moved about, and clomb
E'en to the highest he could climb, and saw,
Straining his eyes beneath an arch of hand,
Or thought he saw, the speck that bare the king
Down that long water opening on the deep
Somewhere far off, pass on and on, and go
From less to less and vanish into light,
And the New Sun rose, bringing the New Year.

CHAPTER I.

THERE is surely every reason why all men should have the Word of God in their own tongue so as not to be wholly dependent on oral instruction. For the Bible contains not only the seminal truths of theology and those higher doctrines which find fitting expression in service and worship, but it takes up the relations, duties, and trials of social and public life. It has a loving edict for the parent, and another for the child. It offers a word to the master, with a reciprocal word to the servant; and it contains a directory for the hearth and household. It breathes promises of special tenderness to the widow and orphan, and presents indescribable comfort and hope to the bereaved. It dwells on patience and humility, condescension and self-denial, disinterested love and unwearied beneficence, as characteristic graces. Buyer and seller are included in its equitable precepts; tilling, sowing, and reaping find a place among its allusions; and even the animals yoked to labour are not forgotten in its pervading kindness. It sanctions the sword of the magistrate, and enjoins the "quiet and peaceable" life of the citizen. The wages of the soldier, the hire of the workman, the thirst and weariness of the traveller, the care of the poor and the stranger, are not beneath its notice. The maiden is wedded with its blessing, and the grave is closed under its comforting assurances. In hallowing the "life that now is," it shows the pathway to "that which is to come." In the entire range of literature, no book is so frequently quoted or referred to. The text of no ancient author has summoned into operation such an amount of labour; and it has furnished occasion for the most masterly examples

of criticism and comment. The fathers of the first centuries expounded it, and the divines of the middle ages refined upon its statements. It whetted the penetration of Abelard, and exercised the keenness and subtlety of Aquinas. It gave life to the revival of letters, and Dante and Petrarch revelled in its imagery. Our New Testament has inspired the English muse with her loftiest strains. It does effective service in many of the dialogues of Shakespeare; its beams gladdened Milton in his darkness, and cheered the soul of Cowper in his sadness. Among the Christian classics it opened up spheres of thought and research to Ussher, Jewel, and Lardner; it charged the fulness of Hooker, barbed the point of Baxter, gave colours to the palette and sweep to the pencil of Bunyan, and enriched the fragrant fancy of Taylor.

The Bible is thus a people's book, overshadowing with its authority individuals, households, churches, and kingdoms; including in its jurisdiction persons of every rank, age, and calling, from birth to death; telling all men what to believe, what to obey, and how to suffer; developing a nation's wealth in its truest form, and fostering liberty and fraternity in their only genuine merit and meaning. The people of this country were naturally very glad to have such a volume in their common speech; and when they got any fragment of it they cherished it with reverential fondness, and in days when it was forbidden to have it or read it, they secreted it with jealous care, and in a quiet hour took it from its concealment and stealthily pondered over it. No wonder that so many men and women suffered all penalties rather than give it up or confess that it was criminal to have the Psalter or Gospels in their "own tongue wherein they were born." The man therefore who first gave such a gift in its integrity to his people deserves to be "held in everlasting remembrance."

The year and place of the birth of John of Wycliffe cannot be definitely ascertained, but his territorial surname was probably taken from the parish of his birth, in the vicinity of Richmond, Yorkshire.¹ There were several persons who

¹ The various accounts of the date and the incidents of his career, may and locality of the Reformer's birth, be found in the various chapters of

bore it: a William de Wycliffe, one of the fellows of Balliol, where John was Master; and in 1363, William de Wycliffe was presented by a John de Wycliffe to the rectory of Wycliffe-on-Tees. The time of his birth also can only be conjectured. Probably it was before A.D. 1324. Nor do we know when he entered the University of Oxford, though he is said to have been enrolled in Queen's College in the very year of its foundation. But this date of 1340, commonly assigned as the commencement of his academic life, has no tangible ground of support. It is certain, however, that he was Master of Balliol in 1361. On the 4th of May of the same year, he was presented by his College to the rectory of Fyningham, in Lincolnshire, and shortly afterwards he went to reside on his living. The common assertion that he was, in December, 1365, appointed Warden of Canterbury Hall, by Archbishop Islip its founder, rests on insufficient evidence, for the chronicles are silent about it. No contemporary mentions it but Wodeford, and Professor Shirley has at least shaken the validity of his testimony.¹ Besides, the Reformer was Doctor by 1366; but in 1365 the Master of Canterbury Hall is simply called Master of Arts in his deed of appointment. Three years afterwards he is styled Bachelor of Divinity; while the Reformer had been a Doctor of several years' standing at that period. The wardenship of Canterbury Hall, and the fellowship of Merton College, may therefore belong to another John Wycliffe, or Whyteclyve, Vicar of Mayfield. Islip, according to Archbishop Parker, intended to invest his hall with the

his life, as written by Lewis, London, 1720; Gilpin, Do., 1766; Vaughan, Do., 1828, 1831; and in a Monograph, 1853; Le Bas, 1832; Baber in his Preface to his edition of the New Testament, 1810; and Lechler's Johannes von Wiclif, Leipzig, 1873. Interesting information on these and other points may be found in Forshall and Madden's edition of the Wycliffite Versions. Oxford, 1850. The name itself is

spelt in several ways, the commoner forms being Wiclif and Wyclif.

¹ Introduction to his edition of the Fasciculi Zizaniorum Magistri Johannis Wiclif cum tritico, ascribed to Thomas Netter of Walden, published under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, London, 1858. There are also able articles on Wycliffism by Lewald and Lechler, in Neidner's Zeitschrift, 1846-47-53.

patronage of Mayfield; and from Mayfield the deed of appointment to the wardenship is dated.¹ Prior to 1367 Wycliffe had become one of the royal chaplains to Edward III, and in November, 1368, he exchanged his first living of Fylingham for that of Ludgershall in Buckinghamshire, being presented to it by Sir John Pavely, Prior of the Knights Hospitallers of St. John. In 1374 he was preferred by the king to the rectory of Lutterworth, and in this parish he laboured till his death. He was also, on the 6th of November, 1375, confirmed by the crown in the prebend of Aust in the collegiate church of Westbury; but in the same month he resigned the appointment. It would seem that at several periods in 1363-4, 1374-5, and 1380, Wycliffe rented rooms in Queen's College, and that he often preached before the University. He was never, in the modern sense, a professor of divinity, though the statement has been often made; but as the degree of Doctor conferred the privilege of lecturing, the title in Latin being *Sacrae Theologiae Professor*, he certainly availed himself of his academic position in the first theological school of Europe to expound and enforce his views. The "word of the Lord was as a fire in his bones," and he "could not refrain." His terseness and earnestness were irresistible; his power and popularity produced abundant fruit. Any detailed account of his doctrines, or of the various charges and prosecutions to which they led, is not necessary to our present purpose. His firm and avowed resistance to the Romish usurpation, to its tyrannous policy, its crooked diplomacy, and its unscriptural theology, so edged and animated his sermons, speeches, and publications, both in Latin and English, that he could not be overlooked; for he had not spoken in honeyed words or in whispered rebuke, and his honest, patriotic wrath had boiled over in racy and unsparing denunciation. Though he was a realist, he had ventured to impugn the central tenet of transubstantiation, affirming that the body of the Lord is spiritually or sacra-

¹ On this point of the wardenship the evidence is not perfectly satisfactory. Dean Hook accepts at once Professor Shirley's theory of two Wycliffes, Dean Milman remained in doubt, but Dr. Vaughan held without hesitation to the common opinion. Monograph, c. iii, pp. 42-63.

mentally present, though the elements of bread and wine remain unchanged. At length, after being arraigned several times, his doctrines were formally condemned, and the Reformer, who had experienced the fickleness of princes, for his patron, John of Gaunt,¹ had deserted him in the crisis, felt it necessary to withdraw finally from Oxford to his parish of Lutterworth, where he spent the last two years of his life. Though, according to Dr. Gascoigne,² his health had already been broken by incipient paralysis, his literary industry was still incessant, and many of his works, including his noted *Dialogus*, were published during this interval. But his fertile brain sunk at length under the intense and continuous pressure. On the 29th of December, 1384, as he was officiating at mass, he was struck with palsy, and he died on the last day of the year.³

The literary works of Wycliffe—the longer ones in Latin which spoke to the educated mind of Europe, and the shorter ones in English—are very numerous; and Professor Shirley's

¹ At his trial in St. Paul's, before Courtenay, then Bishop of London, he was befriended, with some bravado, by John of Gaunt, and the Earl Marshal Lord Percy, the father of Hotspur. The further procedure of another trial at Lambeth was forbidden by Sir Lewis Clifford, in name of the Dowager Princess of Wales, granddaughter of Edward I, and now widow of the Black Prince and mother of the reigning king. Her first husband had been the Earl of Kent, and the eldest brother of Courtenay had married her sister. Courtenay himself was the fourth son of the Earl of Devon, his mother, Margaret de Bohun, also being a grand-daughter of Edward I.

² "In the ninth yere of this kyng, John Wiclif, the orgon of the devel, the enmy of the Cherch, the confusion of men, the ydol of heresie, the meroure of ypocrisie, the norischer of scisme, be the rithful dome of God, was smet with a horibil paralsie threwoute his body." Walsingham, *Hist. Angl.*, p. 119, ed. by Henry F. Riley, Rolls ed. According to Capgrave, this "rightful doom of God" was very visible, for he was smitten on the day of St. Thomas (Becket), and he died on that of St. Silvester, and both saints he had treated with unbelieving scorn. Chronicle, p. 240, edited by

³ Cotton MSS., Otho 14, British Museum. He had declined on account of physical debility to obey a summons from Urban VI to appear at Rome.

H. C. Hingeston, Rolls ed., 1858.

catalogue, of more than sixty octavo pages, does not contain nearly the whole of them. There are many copies in the British Museum, in the University Libraries of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, in the library of Lambeth Palace, in the Chapter Library at Prague, and very many in the Imperial Library of Vienna. Many productions have been wrongly ascribed to him; and the genuineness of what is called his first work, "The Last Age of the Church," is liable to very grave suspicions. The extreme form in which he expressed some of his opinions might tend to mislead the unwary, who might not trace his own fences, or follow out his own distinctions. Though he was the most popular writer in Europe, he was often obliged to explain himself. "Many lewd opinions or misconceptions were fathered upon him," while men like Melancthon misunderstood both his politics and his theology.¹ But our immediate concern is not with Wycliffe's general works, nor with the harmony of his views, nor the consistency of his own acting with his avowed opinions. These things belong to a history of the period. Collier, Milner, Lewis, Le Bas, Lingard, Gilpin, Massingberd, Vaughan, and Lechler will be found to differ widely in their estimate of the Reformer's deeds and doctrines.

Three epochs may be noted in Wycliffe's life:—the first during which he published logical, physical, and philosophical treatises. The second is marked by his works as a reformer, given more to destruction than re-organization. The third is distinguished by productions specially polemical; and, indeed, in the preface to the "De Dominio Divino" he indicates his intention of devoting the rest of his time and labour to theology. Professor Shirley says, "This preface seems to me the true epoch of the beginning of the English Reformation," Wycliffe translated many verses and clauses for his

¹ Luther refers to him as *spitzigen Wycleff*; and after admitting *Insuper Wiglephum tantum*, Melancthon accuses him of not believing or holding the righteousness of faith. Milner virtually accepts the accusa-

tion, and insinuates that "it is not to be wondered at that he who maintained that tithes were mere alms" should be accused of supporting Tyler and Straw. Church Hist., vol. v, pp. 120-130.

"English¹ Tracts"; and such renderings made by him for an immediate end differ often from his formal translation. Others, to serve a similar purpose, must have done the same—translated for themselves. Thus Chaucer, in his "Parson's Tale," rendered for himself; and the majority of more than ninety of his quotations bear no resemblance to Wycliffe's version, though a few have the unavoidable similitude of two versions of the same easy Latin.

¹ It is one of the charges of Polydore Vergil against him that, not content with writing Latin tracts, he wrote English ones also. "Comentarios patria lingua conscriptos fecit." Hist. Angliæ, lib. 19.

CHAPTER II.

WYCLIFFE had always valued Scripture far above tradition and ecclesiastical authority. He had been in alliance with it during all his public career, as he had found in it the basis of his arguments and the edge and power of his rebukes. He had written several works on the Gospels, and he had expounded other sections of the New Testament, especially the Apocalypse, a book which sounded like a trumpet peal in those days of plague, when Death on the pale horse seemed to be careering through the land. His prelections, sermons, and tracts had ever brought him into connection with Scripture, which he—as we have just said—translated on quoting it. At length, from these perpetual fractional renderings, there naturally rose up before his mind the project of preparing a full translation, and if the project were challenged, he had but to reply, Why should not every man's guide be in every man's hand? Before 1378, he does not distinctly dwell on the duty of giving to his age an English Bible, but after that year there are in his writings allusions which imply that the idea was growing to be a fixed and familiar one. About the period of his retirement from Oxford in 1381, the enterprise involving issues so momentous had been begun, the portions translated being put into immediate circulation. A review of his past services, with their difficulties, dangers, and obstacles; a survey of the civil and ecclesiastical condition of the country; and a prophetic anticipation of the benefits to be derived from an unfettered national Bible, strengthened him in his purpose, and enabled him to carry it through before his death. The mind of Wycliffe was thus drawn by many concurrent influences to

the work of translation; and his translated Scriptures met, and were intended to meet, the great want of his time.¹

And, first, several forms of agitation and conflict were tending to unsettle old traditional opinions and beliefs, and many inquirers were longing for the possession of the written Verity in the language of their own day. For the age of Wycliffe was one of great excitement; and the papal supremacy as a foreign usurpation had begun to encounter stout resistance. From the days of the weak King John, and during the long reign of his son, Henry III, whom Dante has put into his purgatory as an idiot or simpleton, the Popes had been trafficking largely in English benefices. Strangers held rich livings and did no duty, as they were either ignorant of the language or were absentees, so that, besides the payment of Peter's pence, large sums were sent abroad to papal courtiers and dependents, who plundered the country with unwearying and unsatisfied rapacity. In wantonness of power, Pope Innocent IV had commanded Grosseteste,² Bishop of Lincoln, to induct his nephew, Di Lavagna, into one of his canonries, "any statute of the church notwithstanding." Pope Honorius asked a living to be given to a man who was deacon of Thessalonica, and insisted that two prebends in every cathedral should be held in perpetuity by his nominees. The deanery of Salisbury was held by the Cardinal of St. Prassede, that of Lichfield by the Cardinal of St. Sabina, and that of York by the Cardinal of St. Angelo, as if "God had given his sheep not to be pastured, but to be shaven and shorn." These are but samples of the papal love of gold and power, taken from a return presented to the crown of benefices held by aliens. But, in 1366, Edward III and his parliament had refused to pay the Italian Pontiff, Urban V, the annual

¹ It is notable that at this time various attempts toward a translation were made by different parties. Forshall & Madden's preface, pp. xi-xiv.

² The letter of the Pope, making the request, and Grosseteste's "bitter pistle" of refusal may be seen in Grosseteste's *Epistolæ*, p. 432, Rolls ed. His friend, Adam de Marisco, praises the letter as "powerful, fearless, prudent, and eloquent"; but the Pope, on receiving it, stormed at the writer of it, as insane—*surdus et absurdus*. *Ibid.*, p. lxxx.

tribute, which had not been sent to Rome for a considerable period. The arrears had now swelled to a large amount,¹ and the Reformer, as one of the royal chaplains, supported the refusal in a terse and telling tract, written under the form of a report of a parliamentary debate.² There had been also the seventy years' captivity—from 1305 to 1376—from Clement V to Gregory XI, and there ensued, in 1378, the great schism—one Pope at Rome and the other at Avignon, tossing curses at each other;³ the boast of one living head and vicar disappearing in storm and recrimination. The mitred rivals preached crusades against one another, and prepared to decide by an appeal to arms which was the true representative of the Prince of Peace. In defence of the claims of the Pope at Rome, Spencer the warlike bishop of Norwich,⁴ actually sailed with an army across the Channel, and massacred the population of Gravelines, so that "not even an infant remained alive." Four thousand Flemings were also murdered at Dunkirk. Indulgences were promised to all that joined his ranks, and to all who contributed to the expense of the expedition, which miserably failed. Wycliffe took up such a public scandal, saying, "Antichrist puts many thousand lives in danger for

¹ That the Pope derived from England every year a sum five times larger than the royal revenue, may be inferred from the address of the "good parliament" in 1376, the decisions of that parliament having been guided by "Lord Edward the Prince, who gave them his counsel and aid effectually." Longman's History of Edward III, vol. II, p. 249. On the rapacity of the Cardinal of St. Prassede, when he was on a special embassy in England, see Milman, vol. VIII, p. 184. Higden and Fabyan ascribe the rapid spread of Wycliffe's opinions to the schism which the English parliament called "damnable."

² The document may be found

in Foxe, II, p. 587, London, 1837.

³ England held by Urban, the Pope at Rome; and, of course, Scotland held by his rival Clement, at Avignon.

⁴ Rymer, *Fœdera*, VII, 41. Spencer, or le Despencer, figures among the illustrious Henrys in Capgrave's volume. He first tasted blood at the time of Wat Tyler's uprising. He had "the zeal of Phinehas," and, having seized three depredators—Sceth, Trunch, and Cubith—he, without any trial, had them executed, *confessos fecit decollari*. Jek Litster, a ringleader, shared the same fate. De Illust. Henricis, p. 171, Rolls ed.

his own wretched life. Why, is he not a fiend stained foul with homicide who, though a priest, fights in such a cause?"

The Pope, in spite of English law, was still disposing of ecclesiastical preferments in England; and Wycliffe was sent in 1375, on a royal commission to meet the papal nuncio at Bruges—the other delegates being the Earl of Salisbury, Sudbury, Bishop of London, and John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster.¹ After long deliberation a compromise, or rather a suspension of hostilities, was agreed to; but the statutes of Provisors and Præmunire, to the violation of which penalties increasing in severity had from time to time been annexed, still remained in force.

Now, the freedom of the church, the kingdom, and the individual conscience from all foreign control was a first principle in Wycliffe's patriotism; and he felt that the possession and study of Scripture formed the truest charter and safeguard of national and ecclesiastical independence. Therefore he resolved to put the English Bible into the hands of the English people; and its rapid circulation showed that many good and true spirits were ready to give it cordial welcome.

At the same time the Mendicant Orders which had been established to repress evils, that neither church nor cloister seemed able to cope with, had fallen into gross degeneracy. They had become so numerous and so violent as to draw upon them the reprobation of the working clergy, whom they were supplanting by their easier and cheaper terms of confession and penance; and the University of Oxford had risen in rage against them, for they had striven hard to monopolize the education of young men;² and endeavoured to maintain an independent and separate jurisdiction which infringed or superseded the statutes. They had so thwarted and opposed the academic authorities,

¹ The Exchequer accounts show that Wycliffe was absent from the country less than two months—

from 27th July to 14th September—that he was paid at the rate of twenty shillings a day; that the total money paid him was £52, 2s. 3d., a considerable sum in present value, and that this included the expenses of the journey.

² Of these four Orders the Dominicans or Blackfriars came to England in 1212, the Franciscans or Greyfriars in 1224, the Carmelites or Whitefriars in 1250, and the Augustines in 1252.

that the number of students had dwindled down to 6,000; while according to Wood,¹ there had been 30,000 in the days of Henry III. Parents alarmed at the risk to which their sons were exposed, refused to send them to college. Convocation had been obliged to pass an Act, declaring that no youth should be admitted into the Order of Friars under eighteen years of age. Wycliffe on behalf of his Alma Mater, threw himself into the contest with such skill, learning, and energy as to confound his antagonists. But over and above his own assaults, and the satirical scourgings of Chaucer and Langland,² Wycliffe felt that the most effectual exposure of these cunning and covetous itinerants and "pardoners" lay in presenting to the people, in their own tongue, the life and acts of our blessed Lord and His Apostles—the true patterns of all evangelical labour and self-denial.

Again, the ominous and alarming condition of both the state and church must have filled Wycliffe with profound anxiety. At one period of Edward's splendid reign, three foreign sovereigns did him homage. The king of France and the king of Scotland had been carried to London as prisoners, and the king of Cyprus was imploring help. Cressy had been fought in 1346, and the imperial crown had, in 1347, been offered to him. Commerce had flourished, while conquests had been gained. But the glory of the earlier part of his reign had passed into eclipse. His allies forsook him, and there were great military reverses

¹ The statement is made by Armachanus (Richard Fitzralph of Armagh, the Primate) and by Gascon, once Chancellor of Oxford, who referred for its truth to the "rolls of the Old Chancellors." In his exposure of the Friars, Wycliffe had been preceded by Fitzralph, who delivered an "Apology" against them to the Pope at Avignon, 1352, alluded to by Wycliffe in his *Triologus*, and he preached also in London on the subject. Died at Avignon in 1360.

² Langland's *Vision of Piers Plowman* (1362) was edited by Skeat for the Early English Text Society, London, 1867. Another poem by a different author, and somewhat later date (1394), *Piers Plowman's Crede*, flagellates the religious orders with still greater severity. Edited also by Skeat for the Early English Text Society, London, 1867. See also William Langland, a grammatical treatise, by Emil Bernard, Bonn, 1874.

in France. He had been saluted by his people and by "all countries" as king of the sea; but his navy, which had achieved such renown off the Sluys in 1340, and off Winchelsea in 1350, had perished. There were also growing complaints of domestic confusion; the Black Prince, the hope of the nation, had died in 1376; and the king, sinking into premature dotage, had become the victim of a rapacious and shameless concubine. Patriotic men felt sad misgivings, and were alarmed for the stability of the realm amidst the animosity of contending factions, for the Duke of Lancaster was filled with rancorous and all but unaccountable enmity to William of Wykeham. The hierarchy were engaged in statecraft and diplomacy, and the wealth and splendour of churchmen had passed into a proverb. The relation of the peasants to the land had grown wholly unsettled, the industrial classes were being pressed down into pauperism, and new social laws, worse than the statute of "Labourers," were sharply grinding the "faces of the poor," and subjecting not only the peasants, but "artificers and people of mysteries" to annoying restrictions as to work and wages. The downtrodden masses had found an exponent in Langland's "*Vision of Piers the Plowman*." The poet was very loyal himself, but his verses told the peasant's sense of many wrongs in the peasant's own tongue, gave voice to the thoughts of myriads writhing under misrule, and combined their fragmentary utterances into one prolonged denunciation.¹

The Black Death or pestilence, which had appeared first at Dorchester in 1348, and swept over the country during the next year and a half, had returned in 1361, 1369, and 1375. The first outbreak of the epidemic had carried off half of the population, two millions and a half out of five millions, the mortality, being greatest among the poor or lower orders, or, as the record of the king and council calls them, "workmen and servants." While land at once fell in value, labour rose in price, and

¹ Langland, a secular priest, of Reformer's honesty and boldness, the West of England, belonged to and the ring of Cædmon's alliterative metres is often felt in his verses.

the numerous efforts of the legislature to neutralize this inevitable result were fruitless, for no power can repeal the divine law which regulates supply and demand. Wages were in this way thrown into disorder, and capital and labour came into collision. In defiance of feudal law, labourers left their lord's soil and took refuge in the towns; many of the serfs detached from the land became paupers, and there was a great increase of "valiant beggars and vagabonds." Serfdom was everywhere, the "villeins regardant" passing to a new owner, like the trees on the estate, and villeins "in gross" being liable to be sold off the property like the cattle reared upon it.¹ Discontent and poverty so naturally created, at once and fiercely traced themselves to misgovernment and class legislation. In 1377, the last year of the reign of Edward III, a poll-tax of fourpence had been exacted from all persons, both males and females, above fourteen years of age; and in 1379 another similar tax had been imposed with a scheme of graduation. But the last grievance of a third poll tax, mercilessly enforced, led, in 1380, to a terrible uprising, headed by Wat Tyler.² If "oppression makes a wise man mad," it cannot but infuriate such as have no pretension to the possession of wisdom, or of any acquaintance with political economy. Struggling for freedom, these rebels blundered into communism, and advocated the abolition of social ranks and distinctions, so that those above them should be cast down by force to their own low level.³ After the revolt had been quenched, the executions or legal murders of the poor fugitives ordered by Chief Justice Tressilian, in various parts of the country, amounted to 1,500.⁴ As the causes of the

¹ Act 12 Richard II, c. 4, seized by them, and barbarously complains that servants will not murdered.

work "without outrageous and excessive hire." See Pashley on Pauperism, p. 163; Eden's State of the Poor, vol. I, p. 42.

² Archbishop Sudbury, who, as Chancellor, had carried the obnoxious tax through Parliament, and who had scornfully called the insurgents "shoeless ribalds," was

³ A good account of the causes of the revolt will be found in Cartwright's Life of Gustave Bergenroth, Edinburgh, 1870; also in Creasy's History of England, vol. II, chap. iv.

⁴ Under Lord Chancellor Arundel, Tressilian himself was, on a charge of treason, hanged at Tyburn in 1388.

insurrection had been deeply seated and long felt, and the movement was so widely spread, it was not easily or at once suppressed. The serpent in its agony had turned round and bitten the heel that was heavily treading on its neck. After the convulsion, Parliament resolved that it would not liberate the villeins, even though the refusal should lead to its own destruction; and it sanctioned the king's revocation of all the promises which he had solemnly made to the victors during their brief hour of supremacy.

But there is no proof that Wycliffe's teaching, or his Bible, was connected with the tumult, though the accusation has been often made against him, as by Harpsfeld (Alanus Copus¹) and by Lingard.² The charge was repeated down to the time of Tyndale.³ "They said it in Wycliffe's times, and the hypocrites say now likewise, that God's word causeth insurrection." The judges who tried the rebels never blamed Wycliffe; his patron, the Duke of Lancaster, was the object of popular vengeance. His palace was burned, and when the insurgents swore fidelity to the sovereign, they took an oath against accepting any king whose name was John, referring to John of Gaunt who was suspected of aspiring to the crown.⁴ Wycliffe's bitter opponents Walsingham and Knighton are silent on the point, though they were anxious to heap all kinds of accusations on his head. Walsingham ascribes the revolt to the Mendicant orders, to the guilt of the prelates in not persecuting the new heresy, to the bad lives and atheistical principles of the lords and their tyranny over the commonalty, and to the general depravity of the people. Nay, he says that a leader of the rebels admitted that the object of their attempt to overthrow the hierarchy was to establish the Mendicant orders in their room; and certainly Jack Straw, one of the foremost

¹ Fuller's Church History, vol. I, p. 454. ⁴ The birth name of Robert III of Scotland was John, and it had to be changed on his accession.

² History, vol. III, p. 143.

³ Preface to the Exposition of St. John Baliol, John of England, and John, p. 225, Parker Society John of France were not easily edition; Forshall and Madden, forgotten. preface to Wycliffe, p. 15.

demagogues, made such a confession before his execution.¹ With such a project certainly Wycliffe could have no sympathy. John Ball, the priest orator among the insurgents, is stigmatized by Knighton as "the forerunner of Wycliffe," thus absolving the latter from all participation, direct or indirect, in the revolt.² Wycliffe in fact, as being a royal chaplain, "standing on a peculiar footing" with the crown, and from his relationship to John of Gaunt, belonged to the very class against which the malcontents had risen; and any resort to arms in order to redress wrongs, the Reformer steadily discouraged. The "moral Gower,"³ who was both a Kentish squire and a beneficed layman, has, in his poem *Vox Clamantis*,⁴ depicted, both simply and in allegory, the character of the ring-leaders and of the mob, but he makes no allusion to Wycliffe, and yet he exposes the vices of the clergy with earnest severity. He thus photographs Ball—

"Ball was the preacher, the prophet, the teacher,
Inspired by a spirit of hell,
And every fool was advanced in his school,
To be taught as the devil thought well."

Froissart, in his minute history of the insurrection, does not associate Wycliffe with it in any way, the chief motive ascribed by him to the armed mob being the plunder of the wealthy, and the destruction of all muniments and

¹ The attainder of Jack Straw, the Duke of Lancaster, the head of "the priest of the men of Essex," the four orders of Mendicants command of Wat Tyler, John Hancach, and plains of Hereford and others, as not Robert Phipp, may be found in 3 only stirring up the insurrection, but Rot. Parl. 175, 1385., as laying the blame of it on those orders themselves." Walden, p. 292, ed. Shirley.

² Veluti Christus Johannem baptistam. Knighton's Hist. Angl. Script., tom. II, p. 2644. Walden describes the Wycliffite heresy as fomenting dissensions everywhere, but does not charge it with being the cause of the uprising, though from its spread the clergy feared for a future insurrection. In a letter to

³ Gower died in 1408, an old and blind man, in the religious house of St. Mary Overies, Southwark.

⁴ Edited by H. O. Coxe, M.A., London, 1850, for the Roxburgh Society.

charters which might prove their vassalage.¹ There had also been several upheavings of a similar kind on the Continent, and these, in the French Chronicler's opinion, encouraged and provoked the outbreak.² Fabyan, too, in his "Chronicles of England," makes no mention of Wycliffe in connection with the Kentish explosion. The Commons, in answer to the King's address commanding inquiry into the causes of the recent troubles, boldly say, after a long enumeration of abuses, "To speak the truth, these injuries lately done to the poorer commons, more than ever they suffered before, caused them to rise and commit the mischief done in the late riots." After dwelling on the great hardships inflicted on the commons, such as subsidies, tallages, and the oppressive practices of the royal purveyors, they added that justice had been so badly administered that "right and law had come to nothing." Thus those who had made prolonged official inquiry into the origin of the outbreak assign sufficient causes for it in these memorable words, but they never allege that Wycliffe's Bible, or Tracts, or "preachers," had any hand in it. In fact, Wycliffe's followers were not found among the villeins and serfs, but rather among the tradesmen in towns,³ and among the middle classes. He said himself that fully a third of the clergy agreed with him in their hearts, and Knighton complains that "of every two persons you met in the street, one was a Lollard." In the document issued the year after the outbreak by the archbishop to Peter Stokes the Carmelite, detailing the errors of Wycliffe, which had been condemned by a synod, there is no allusion to the insurgents or to any connection of Wycliffe with them. Heresies alone are recorded, and these are vaguely said to threaten "to subvert and enervate the peace of the king-

¹ Chronicles, vol. I, p. 641, London, 1812. floated over many territories, had not yet been unfurled.

² Thirteen hundred revolted Swiss peasants had with marvellous skill and valour broken the Austrian power at the memorable battle of Morgarten in 1315, but the terrible banner of the *Bundschuh*, which soon

³ Among the tradesmen mentioned as Wycliffites in a proclamation of 20th May are goldsmiths, plumbers, fleshers, weavers, coopers, hosiers, honeymongers, and fletchers or arrow makers. Rymer, *Fœdera*, IX, 129.

dom." In fact, Wycliffe's influence was seriously injured by the rebellion, and it interrupted for a time his great work. But he himself was no demagogue, for, like Occam, he maintained that the civil power must ever be supreme. John Ball admitted in his last confession that he had been a disciple of Wycliffe for two years; but he had been imprisoned on several previous occasions for heretical turbulence by the ecclesiastical authorities, and he had been under Archbishop Langham's censure as far back as 1366, a period long before the "poor priests" were heard of. He made frequent use of the imagery and characters of Piers the Plowman; but he does not seem at any time to have quoted Wycliffe or his books—his favourite and suggestive text being the familiar couplet—

"When Adam dalve, and Eve span,
Who was then the gentleman?"

Wycliffe's theory about God as the Lord Paramount is only a feudal paraphrase of the old saying, "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof," and his oft quoted sentiment that dominion is founded on grace has no more political heresy in it than our common formula, "Victoria, by the grace of God, Queen of Great Britain." But his ideal dominion founded on grace yielded to the actual, for he inculcated passive obedience on the part of Christians to the powers that be, even "though they be wicked and ungodly," and this he advocated so extravagantly that his enemies represented him as teaching that "God ought to obey the devil"—*quod Deus obedire debet diabolo*. His disciple Huss held a similar view. He launched vehement invective against ecclesiastics holding lands and offices of state, as against William of Wykeham, whom he characterized as one of "those who were wise in building castles."¹ But while he

¹ There was certainly good ground for complaint, since at one time, about 1367, from the Lord Chancellor down to the Master of the Wardrobe and Inspector of Buildings, all the higher officers in the court of Edward III, to the number of twenty-two, were priests in possession of benefices. It was the characteristic policy of the Duke of Lancaster's party, to which Wycliffe belonged, to have such churchmen superseded by laymen. Little more than a century ago, the Duke of

argued that temporal property should not be protected by spiritual thunder, he was no leveller, and his poor priests were only a provisional measure, though they exhibited somewhat of the compactness and elasticity of an ecclesiastical order.¹

Though Wycliffe had no personal nor secondary connection with the outbreak, he must have been greatly distressed by the grievous confusion reigning around him. His numerous polemical tractates discussed the important themes and questions of the day, and by a wide and speedy circulation they must have excited no small interest, and though they passed round only in manuscript, they awakened public thought. Their popularity was enhanced by their clear and incisive style; and though they are composed in the rudeness of an unformed language, they still charm modern readers by their quaint rusticity, their vigorous antithesis, and their rugged symmetry of hearty utterance. But while these publications aimed at and pleaded for the extinction of various forms of injustice and outrage, there was still needed the introduction of a remedial power mightier by far than "the words of man's wisdom," in order to restore harmony, and raise up and shield "the poor and him, that hath no helper." And thus the unsettledness of the period with its bitter strifes, the rooted enmity of class against class,²

York, second son of George III, was in his infancy made Bishop of Osnaburgh, the first Saxon diocese founded by Charlemagne.

¹ One is almost tempted to imagine that the order of poor priests in some way suggested the strange misrendering in both versions of Matt. xi, 5, "pore men ben taken to prechyng of the gospel"—the note in the first version being "ben madd helpers of the gospel." At the same time there occurs in one of his sermons another mistranslation, "pore men ben preisd of God." Select Works of John Wycliffe, vol. I, p. 71, ed. Arnold, Oxford, 1869. Some light is cast on the subject in Wycliffe's

well-known tract, "Why poor priests have no benefices." The "poor priests, clad in russet, with staff in hand, scoured the country, and preached" daily in churches and church-yards, and at markets and fairs, "to great congregations." Another mistranslation is sometimes said to be polemical in aim, 1 Peter iv, 12, "Nyle ye go in pilgrimage in fervour"; but the fault lies with the Latin translation, which Wycliffe gives literally.

² A straw may show the force and direction of the current. Seven years, at least, after Lord Mayor Walworth had killed Wat Tyler, the common Council enacted—"Dogs are not to

the hardheartedness of statesmen, and the ambitious factions of churchmen with their worldliness and intrigues, impressed Wycliffe with the indelible conviction that all ranks needed to know and study the Divine Word in the tongue intelligible to them. For it was the inspired record of a religion which, if fully believed and acted out, sets its brightest jewel in the crown, and guards the purity of the ermine—breathes a just and generous spirit into legislation—gives nobility to the meanest, and the best of graces to the highest—presents every one with an aim worthy of his nature—sanctifies every pursuit as a “calling” in which he may “abide with God”—sends a cheering influence through all the relations of life—lifts the fallen and relieves the needy—visits the “fatherless and widows in their affliction”—opens up a widening circle of spiritual brotherhood, and blends earth with heaven. And under this inspiration he became the translator of the “lively oracles,” which lost none of their life by being told in the homely words of the nation.

Still further, though Wycliffe was one of the quaternion of great schoolmen, and takes rank with Bradwardine, Occam, and Duns Scotus, yet the conceptions which he had formed of a true theology led him to undertake a translation of Scripture. The scholastic divines had indeed built up an intricate theology with logic and metaphysics, with distinctions of marvellous subtlety and arguments of surpassing ingenuity and ability; but the Word of God was allowed to fall into abeyance, and was not taken as of common consent to be the ultimate standard of appeal.¹ Some polemics rested their opinions solely on ecclesiastical canons, as does Walden, who avows—“The decrees of bishops in the Church are of greater authority and dignity than is the authority of Scripture.”² Wycliffe also complains that “Scripture has many impugnors who extol the power of the Pope above it so much as to warrant the inference that he may take

wander about the city, the dogs of the geutry excepted.” Liber Albus, p. 452, ed. Riley.

¹ The *Summa*, or compendium, of Thomas Aquinas, consisting of 1150 folio pages, is called by its author in

the first sentence of his prologue, *lac parvulis*, “milk for babes.” Opera, vol. i, p. 458, ed. Migne, Paris, 1841.

² Walden, Doct. Tri., 1st Lib., c. xxi. Vaughan’s Wycliffe, vol. ii, p. 49.

away one of its books and add a new one.” So that, as an ardent lover of the truth, he longed that the people should know the highest style of all truth as contained in the Word of God, and that Word no longer hidden in a dead and foreign language. He “rolled the stone from the well’s mouth” that all might approach and drink of the living fountain, since the popular systems of divinity, furnishing only an intellectual discipline, and reaching not to the depths of the inner nature, were only as “cisterns, broken cisterns,” at which the thirsty soul could not satisfy itself.

Wycliffe had one special qualification of a translator; for he was so pure in heart and life himself, that his worst enemies, such as Netter de Walden, Wodeford, Knighton, and Walsingham, never uttered a whisper against his character. Arundel himself said, on Thorpe’s trial, “Wickliffe, your author, was a great clerk; many men held him a perfect liver.”¹ His continuons opponent, Kyningham, confessor to the Duke of Lancaster, wrote a series of tracts against Wycliffe—*Ingressus*, *Acta*, *Determinationes*—in which he complains of his personalities and of his books, but he does not assail his life. He was even reported to be “a ruly man, and an innocent in his living.” The worst said of him, as by Anthony Wood, was, that he became a reformer from “nothing else” than spite at the Pope’s treatment of him in connection with the wardenship of Canterbury Hall; but the assertion cannot be borne out, as the warden was probably another person of the same name. It was also insinuated by Walden, and the insinuation was repeated down to the days of Polydore Vergil, that his zeal against the ruling ecclesiastics arose from his disappointment at not receiving the see of Worcester; but it is easy to suggest and propagate such stories. Knighton admits that he was generally an eminent theologian, and that he was unequalled in the art of scholastic disputation. Though the hostile epithets bestowed upon him are wide and wild, and are sometimes thrown up in ludicrous accumulation, they touch not his personal repute. Walsingham calls him by a poor pun, “Wickedbelief.” Walden, at the Cobham trial, named him the “mid-day

¹ Select Works of Bishop Bale, p. 81, Parker Society Ed.

devil";¹ and another, quoted by Fuller, styles him "the first unclean beast that ever passed through Oxenford."² Pecoock's simple reference is "one clerk; but verily to say, one heretic."

According to the testimony of his contemporaries, he loved the divine law, and walked by its light. To the one volume he ever turned as the book of sole and supreme authority; his instructions and invectives were alike based upon it. To him it was the rule and standard of faith; and he maintained that no conclusion should be accepted that could not be proved out of it—for he held that the authority of the Bible was independent of all other authority. He felt, too, that it was an awful function to translate Scripture so that the true sense might be kept; and he exhorted expositors to dwell as critics on the text, and as grammarians on the letter, with all dependence on the Primary Teacher, lest they should impose a meaning not intended by the Divine Giver of revelation. But he was conscious, at the same time, that his labour was feeble and isolated, so long as those whose welfare he studied were not in possession themselves of the Book. His own use of quotations, and his brief comments on parts of Holy Writ, had been only opening up a single fountain, and he longed that every one should so possess the blessing that, in his earnest acceptance of it, it might "be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life."³ Fully aware was he, in his own words, "that the gospil writun is not to be worschipid," that the possession of vernacular Scripture could not of itself secure spiritual blessing, that there was no saving charm in the familiar sounds and syllables, and that there was ever need of divine grace to make men wise unto salvation. The changes of all kinds

¹ Thomas Netter of Walden, that is Saffron Walden, in Essex, author of the *Fasciculus Zizaniorum*, and numerous treatises against the Lollards, was one of the most accomplished polemics of his day. Born about 1380, disputed at Oxford against Wycliffism, provincial of the Carmelites in 1414, a member of the Council of Constance, Inquisitor-

General for England, and Confessor to Henry V. Died 1430.

² Fuller's short note is "O the wit."

³ The opinions of some contemporaries on the necessity and benefit of translations of Scripture may be found in Forshall and Madden's preface, p. xiv.

which he coveted could only be brought about by profound and popular impression, and that impression could be most easily and speedily deepened and diffused by the circulation of an English Bible. "All secular men," he said, "ought to know the faith; so it is to be taught them, in whatever language is best known to them."—"Christ and his Apostles converted the world by making known the truths of Scripture in a form familiar to them."—"Honest men are bound to declare the doctrine which they hold, not only in Latin, but in the vulgar tongue, that the truth may be more plainly and more fully known."—"Christian men and women, old and young, should study first in the New Testament, should cleave to the study of it; and no simple man of wit, no man of small knowledge, should be afraid to study immeasurably in the sacred text." He wished especially for a full and literal translation; and he accuses the friars of "docking and clipping the Word of God, and tattering it by their rime." "The sacred Scriptures" he held to "be the property of the people, and one which no party should be allowed to wrest from them." Therefore, to move the English mind there must be an English Bible, a gift to the men of his own time, and a rich inheritance to all following centuries; and, such being his conviction, an English Bible was soon provided by him and his devoted assistants.

It may now be admitted that Wycliffe was the first to translate into English the entire Bible. According to the "Compendious Old Treatise,"¹ fragments of vernacular versions had been in circulation, like the Ten Commandments and the Creed, that formed portions of a book "drawn into English under Thoresby, Archbishop of York (1348-56), by a worshipful clerk, named Gattrick, who sent them in small pagines to the common people to learn and know it, and of which many copies yet be in England." It is also told in the same tract, written about 1450, that a man of London, whose name was Wyring, had a Bible in English, of northern speech, which seemed to be

¹ Its purpose is to show that we in his first edition, 1563; by Arber, ought to have the Scriptures in English in 1871; and lithographed in facsimile by Mr. Fry of Bristol. Marburg, 1530; reprinted by Foxe,

two hundred years old; the allusion being probably to Ælfric's Pentateuch. Trevisa, to whom reference has been made already, is said to have translated the Scriptures into English. But Caxton is the only authority, and the assertion is first made in an off-hand way by him in his "Prohemye" to his edition of the Polychronicon—"at the request of Lord Berkeley, Trevisa translated the said book, the Bible, and Bartholomæus de Proprietatibus Rerum."¹ Bale simply repeats Caxton, without any additional evidence;² and he supposed, apparently, that the epistle prefixed to the Polychronicon, beginning with "ego, Johannes Trevisa, sacerdos," was the dedication of a Bible rendered in *Anglicum idioma*. Finally, Ussher³ inserts the statement of Bale, and Wharton copied Ussher,⁴ ascribing the revised version of Wycliffe to John Trevisa. The tradition survived till 1611, and King James's translators, referring to early versions of the Scriptures, say, in their preface, "much about that time, even in our King Richard dayes, John Trevisa translated them into English." But these statements are not to be accepted, for, while many of Trevisa's translations survive, we have no fragment or specimen of an English Bible. The belief probably arose from the circumstance that Trevisa was vicar of the parish of Berkeley, and chaplain to the fourth Lord Berkeley, and that on the roof and walls of the private chapel in the castle are inscribed verses from the Apocalypse in Latin and Norman-French. This work is commonly ascribed to the chaplain;⁵ but the opinion that he translated the Scripture has no palpable basis. Arundel, at the time Archbishop of

¹ Printed by Wynkyn de Worde in 1494.

² Script. Illustr., p. 518, Basil, 1557. Trevisa was a favourite with Bale, as he was toward the monks *rigidus ac mordax*.

³ Hist. Dogmat., p. 346. Opera vol. xii. Dublin.

⁴ Auctar., p. 348. Fuller calls the second or revised Wycliffite translation Trevisa's masterpiece. Church Hist., and vol. I, p. 468.

⁵ In proof of this belief, reference has been made to the Dialogue between a Lord and a Clerk, printed also by Caxton, in which the former says, as if noting something memorable, "also thou notest where the Apocalips is wryten in the walles and roof of a chappel, both in Latyn and in Frensche." The letters are now nearly obliterated. Lewis Hist., p. 50. Fuller gives the story out of Bale. Church History, vol. i, p. 468.

York, in his funeral sermon, preached at Westminster, 3rd August, 1394, for Anne of Bohemia, the "good queen" of Richard II, extols her for her study of the Gospels in English, "though she was a stranger"; these Gospels being sanctioned by the primate himself, who had examined them, and found them to be "good and true." But he intimates nothing as to their age, origin, or literary characteristics, and they may have been one or other of the two Wycliffite versions, which had been some years in circulation. The Constitutions of Arundel, enacted at Oxford in 1408, prohibited all translations, "such as that lately set forth in Wycliffe's time, or since, if they have not the approval of the bishop of the diocese, or of a provincial council." Whatever the canonist Lyndwood¹ might infer, two Bibles only are mentioned—Wycliffe's own version, in his own time, and the version "since," or after his death, viz., the revision made by Purvey. Sir Thomas More,² writing about 1530, affirms that "the whole Bible was, long before Wycliffe's days, by virtuous and well-learned men, translated into the English tongue; and by good and godly people, with devotion and soberness, well and reverently read. . . . For as for old translations, before Wycliffe's time, they remain lawful and be in some folks' hands. Myself have seen and can show you Bibles, fair and old, which have been known and seen by the bishop of the diocese, and left in layman's hands and woman's, to such as he knew for good and catholic folk, that used it in much soberness and devotion." It is, however, to be borne in mind that these striking statements were made by More in artful depreciation of the versions of Wycliffe and Tyndale; that his language is as vague as it is boastful, for he was "in a strait" since he was trying to show that translation in general

¹ Lyndwood, bishop of St. David's, made a digest of the Constitutions of fourteen Archbishops of Canterbury, from Langton down to Chichele; printed at Paris, 1505, at the expense of William Bretton, a merchant of London.

² Dyalogues, p. 138, &c., 1530. No

one could have placed great confidence in Trevisa as a translator; he complains of the difficulty of Higden's very easy Latin, and examples of odd mistakes made by him are given in Babington's preface to the Rolls edition.

was not forbidden, with the exception of these two versions, and yet these were the only ones in existence in early English. He gives us no means of testing his accuracy by any references to the style, history, and locality of such Bibles; and no volumes corresponding to his description have come down to us.¹ To one like More, writing more than a hundred years after, the Wycliffite translations might appear to be a venerable relic of an earlier time, preserved and read by devout Christians. Cranmer, in his preface to the Great Bible of 1540, vindicates the reading of the English Bible by alleging the more ancient custom which had been interrupted not "much above a hundred years ago" by the Arundelian Constitutions, and says that the Bible was translated into the "Saxon's tongue, at that time our mother tongue, which few men are now able to read and understand; and that when this older tongue became obsolete, Scripture was again translated into newer language, whereof many copies remain, and be daily found"—the Wycliffite versions being referred to. Foxe affirms that "before John Wycliffe was born the whole body of the Scripture by sundry men was translated into our country tongue." But there is no proof whatever that any "whole" Anglo-Saxon Bible ever existed, and the martyrologist presents neither proof nor sample. Other inexact statements have been made on the subject. Ussher repeats the assertion of Thomas James about a manuscript Bible in the English tongue, which long preceded Wycliffe's translation, and assigns it to 1290; but Wharton corrects the mistake in his *Auctarium*. In a word, the enemies of Wycliffe's Bible regarded it and branded it as an attempt of unexampled audacity, and its friends, like the Bohemian Huss,² extolled it as an unprecedented gift to the English nation. When the Lollards were assailed by ecclesiastics who denounced the version, had there been any earlier example they would have appealed to it

¹ There is the metrical story of Genesis and Exodus, probably of date 1250; but this "song," as its author styled it, could not be called a translation. Edited by Morris, London, 1865.

² Wycliffe's writings, carried to Bohemia, produced wide and deep impression. The marriage of Richard II to the sister of the Bohemian sovereign had no small influence in fostering such tendencies.

in self-vindication. The prologue to the second or revised translation, while it refers to older Anglo-Saxon Scriptures, expresses the belief that no translation had been published in the language of its own time, and censures the "falseness and negligence of clerks" for not having provided an English Bible for English men. Wycliffe therefore enjoys the priority, and to him may be applied, in the words of his own version, what is said of the son of Onias—"As the dai sterre in the myddes of a cloude, and as a ful moone schyneth in hise daies, and as the sunne schynynge, so he schynede in the temple of God."

CHAPTER III.

THE greater part of the translation of the New Testament is apparently Wycliffe's personal work, and it may have been finished by 1381. There were in circulation also separate books, one Gospel or two Gospels, the Epistles of Paul in whole or in part, the Apocalypse, the Epistle of James, the Ten Commandments, and the Sermon on the Mount. Nicholas de Hereford translated the earlier portion of the Old Testament from Genesis to Baruch iii, 20, and the remainder is ascribed to Wycliffe. The work of Hereford, two manuscripts of which are preserved in the Bodleian Library, stops after the two first words of the verse, Baruch iii, 20,¹ for he was suddenly summoned before a synod of preaching friars in 1382, and at an adjourned meeting held at Canterbury, on the 1st day of July, he was excommunicated. Of these two interesting and valuable manuscripts, the one is a copy, with a note ascribing it to Hereford, and the other is apparently the original work of the translator, the process of translation being visible in the changes made; a portion of a word being sometimes erased before it was fully written. Later hands have corrected it, and several of these revisers may be traced. On appealing to the Pope, Hereford was sent to Rome, and, after trial, was imprisoned; but he contrived to effect his escape, although he does not seem to have returned to England during the life of

¹ The 19th verse ends with "place begins with "The yunge." . . . of hem risen," and the 20th verse

Wycliffe.¹ There are variations, however, in the part usually assigned to him, as from the beginning to the end of 2 Chronicles the active participle usually ends in *yng*e, but afterwards in *ende*. The MSS., however, in the Bodleian Library have been corrected by a contemporary copyist. Between Hereford's part and the other sections of Scripture there are characteristic differences. As a rule, he has no textual glosses, while the continuator admits nine in the very next chapter; but some in the MSS. are the additions of transcribers. Hereford renders so literally as to keep the order of the original, and preserve uniformity of translation; but the continuator absolves himself at once from such strictness. For Hereford's "Mawmet," (Mahomet) he prefers "idol"; and Hereford never employs "damsel" or "wenche," so common in the later books, and in the New Testament. "*Secundum*" is uniformly rendered "after," and *vultus* by "cheer"; but these renderings are not followed beyond Baruch. Hereford, by the close copying of his text, introduced several Latinisms, as, "and him seen," *et viso eo*, but such forms occur also in Wycliffe's own portion. He renders *videbatur* "it was seen," *viso somnio* "a seen vision"; and he thus expresses the accusative before the infinitive, "I dreamed us to binden sheaves." But we have also in other parts of the older version such phrases in close keeping to the Latin as "the hand of her taken" (Mark i, 31); "the knee folden" (i, 40); "yet him speaking" (v, 35); "the Saboth made" (vi, 2); "A manqueller sent" (vi, 27); all in literal reproduction of the ablative

¹ Hereford, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, was among the party a superior scholar, and though he shrank from martyrdom, he endured great suffering along with Purvey in Saltwood Castle. He not only recanted, but in 1393 sat in judgment on a famous Lollard, Walter Brute. In 1391 he had got from the Crown letters protecting him from trouble on account of his earlier views. He became Chancellor of the Cathedral of Hereford in 1394, and Treasurer in 1397

At length, in advanced years, and perhaps ill at ease in his mind, he entered the Carthusian Monastery of St. Anne, Mother of the Virgin, at Coventry, and there died. Repington, another associate of Wycliffe, also submitted, and as a reward of his conformity became, in 1405, Bishop of Lincoln. Being a persecutor of those who held his old opinions, he rose in 1408 to be a Cardinal. Folkestone Williams' *Lives of the English Cardinals*, vol. II, p. 30, London, 1868.

absolute. We have also such other Latinisms as "to make a soul safe" (Mark iii, 4); "saw noise" (v, 38). Hereford also retains several Anglo-Saxon idioms, omits the "s" as the sign of the possessive case, employs "be" in a future sense, keeps the old feminine termination in -ster, but he has the ending in -inge for the earlier -enne with "to" prefixed. Nay, so very sharp is the contrast between him and his successor, that while the participial termination *ende* is found after 2 Chronicles and up to Baruch iii, 19, "goende down to hell," it is immediately changed into -ing and -ynge, as in verse 26, "witynge bataile." Wycliffe's rendering had also been very close, so close as often to be almost a counterpart. Thus, in the first five chapters of John we have such extreme literalness as (i, 5) derknesses; (6) to whom the name was John; (13) bloodis; (14) dwellid in us; (21) what therefore? (26) the myddil man of you stood; (45) whom Moses wroot in the lawe; (46) some good thing be? (ii, 3) wyne failinge; (22) from dead men; (24) beeleved not himself to; (iii, 18) believeth in to him; (29) joyeth in joy; (33) hath markid; (34) forsooth not to mesure; (iv, 8) should buy metis; (11) neither thou hast; (21) womman believe thou to me, for; (23) forwhi and the father seeketh; (26) I am; (45) some little king; (47) bigan to die; (51) came agens him; (52) had him better; (v, 2) little gatis; (5) having eight and thritty years in his sicknesse; (28) all men that ben in buriels; (41) I take not clereness of men.

The translation therefore was soon found to be imperfect, for it wanted self-consistence, and its various parts needed to be brought into harmony of style. A careful revision was accordingly at once commenced, but Wycliffe had died before it was brought to a conclusion, probably about 1388-1390. This edition bears the marks of a very thorough work, which was carried through by Purvey, the curate, and intimate friend of Wycliffe and a leader of the Lollards. According to Knyghton,¹ Purvey boarded with Wycliffe, and thus "drunk more plentifully of his instructions, and to his dying day he followed his master." He was a native of Lathebury, near Olney, Buckinghamshire. After Wycliffe's death, he removed to Bristol, and preached so

¹ De Event. Angliæ Coll., 2660.

zealously as to provoke the resentment of the Bishop of Worcester. He was at length apprehended; but terrified by the fate of Sautre, he openly recanted at Paul's Cross in 1400, and immediately afterwards he was promoted by Archbishop Arundel to the vicarage of Hythe which he resigned in 1403. He was confined a second time by Archbishop Chichele in 1421, was alive in 1427, and perhaps he died in prison. After giving in his prologue¹ an abstract of the books of the Bible, and dwelling on the spiritual benefit to be got from reading it, and defending in a variety of ways the right of the people to have it translated for them, Purvey proceeds to describe his own method of procedure: "For these resons and othere, with comune charite to saue all men in oure rewme, whiche God wole haue sauid, a symple creature hath translatis the bible out of Latyn into English. First, this symple creature hadde myche trauaile, with diuerse felawis and helperis, to gedere manie elde biblis, and othere doctouris, and comune glosis, and to make oo Latyn bible sumdel trewe; and thanne to studie of the newe, the texte with the glose, and othere doctouris, as he mighte gete, and speciali Lire on the elde testament, that helpide ful myche in this werk. . . . First, it is to knowe, that the best translating is out of Latyn, into English, to translate after the sentence, and not oneli after the wordis, so that the sentence be as opyn, either openere in English as in Latyn. . . . In translating into English, many resolucions moun make the sentence open,² as an ablatif case absolute may be resoluid in these thre wordis, with couenable verbe, *the while, for, if*, as gramariens seyn; as thus, *the maistir redinge, I stonde*, may be resoluid thus, *while the maistir redith, I stonde*. . . . Also a participle of a present tens, either preterit, of actif vois, either

¹ The prologue was printed in 1536 with the title "the door of Holy Scripture," and in 1550 as the "Pathway to perfect knowledge," &c.

² Nigh three hundred years afterwards, a scholar thus wrote to Lodge, the translator of Seneca, "Ye have not, parrot-like, spoken his own words, and lost yourself in a Latin echo, rendering him precisely verbatim, as if tied to his tongue." Letter in preface to English Translation of the Works of Seneca, second ed., London, 1620.

passif, may be resoluid into a verbe of the same tens, and a coniunccioun copulatif, as this, *dicens*, that is, *seyynge*, mai be resoluid thus, *and seith*, either *that seith*; and this wole, in manie placis, make the sentence open, where to Englissh it aftir the worde, wolde be derk and doubtful. Also a relatif mai be resoluid into his antecedent with a coniunccioun copulatif, as thus, *which renneth, and he renneth*.

Also whanne rightful construccioun is lettid bi relacion, I resolue it openli, thus, where this reeson, *Dominum forbid-abunt aduersarij ejus*, should be Englisshid thus bi the lettre, *the Lorde his aduersaries shulen drede*, I Englishe it thus bi resolucioun, *the aduersaries of the Lord shulen drede him*. At the begynnyng, I purposide, with Goddis helpe, to make the sentence as trewe and open as it is in Latyn; and I preie for charite and for comoun profyt of cristene soulis, that if ony wiys man fynde ony defaute of the truthe of translacioun, lette him sette in the trewe sentence and opin holi writ, but loke that he examyne truli his Latyn bible, for no doute, he shal fynde ful manye biblis in Latyn ful false, if he loke manie, nameli newe; and the comune Latyn biblis hau more nede to be correctid, as manie as I haue seen in my lif, than hath the English bible late translated; and where the Ebru, by wisesse of Jerome, of Lire, and other expositouris discordith from our Latyn biblis, I haue set in the margyn, bi maner of a glose, what the Ebru hath, and how it is vnderstondun in the same place; and I dide this most in the Sauter, that of all oure bokis discordith most fro Ebru. But in translating of wordis equiuok, that is, that hath manie significacions vnder oo lettre, mai lightli be pereil. . . . Therefore a translatour hath greet nede to studie wel the sentence, both before and aftir, and loke that equiuok wordis acorde with the sentence, and he hath nede lyue a clene lif, and be ful deuout in preiers, and haue not his wit ocupied about worldli thingis, that the Holi Spiryt, autour of wisdom, and kunnyng, and truthe, dresse him in his werk, and suffre him not to erre. . . . God graunte to us alle grace to kunne wel and kepe wel holi write, and suffer ioiefulli sum peyne for it at the last."

Nicholas de Lyra, mentioned in Purvey's prologue, and to

whom Luther also was greatly indebted, was of Jewish blood, and had his surname from the place of his birth. His *Postillæ*, or brief comments on the Bible, are often quoted in the Wycliffite versions. Lyra is not used by Hereford in the earlier portion of the Old Testament which he translated; but "Lire here" occurs frequently, and "Lyra" is often referred to, both in regard to text and version, the references being more frequent in some books than in others. The *glossa ordinaria* so often cited is the compilation of Walafrid Strabo; and another, the compilation of Anselm, a deacon of the church of Laon, is quoted as the "gloss interlineary." But these notes are very unequally distributed, and a few of the Fathers also are sometimes appealed to.

Purvey's manuscript is preserved in the library of the Dublin University.¹ Forshall and Madden give many illustrations of his critical selection of a Latin text, of idiomatic renderings as opposed to too literal ones, of the resolution of the very frequent ablative absolute, and of the present or preterite participle by the use of a conjunction, of the repetition of a word for the sake of perspicuity, of the changes demanded by difference of idiom, and of the varying meanings assigned to the Latin particles. Purvey has made many changes on the first version. The word "forsooth," representing the Latin "autem," occurs perpetually—forty times in the first chapter of Matthew; but Purvey does not employ it at all.

The second version was, for a long period, not carefully distinguished from the first, though Henry Wharton had correctly noted them, and the New Testament was printed as Wycliffe's own version by Lewis in 1731, by Baber in 1810, and in the first column of Bagster's English Hexapla. The New Testament proper of Wycliffe was published by Lea Wilson in 1848, by Bosworth and Waring in 1865, and at an earlier period the Song of Solomon had been edited by Adam Clarke, in the third volume of his Commentary. At length the entire original version and revision appeared in four magnificent quartos, by Forshall and Madden, Oxford, 1850—the fruit of twenty-two

¹ An account of an unfinished revision of Forshall and Madden's edition of Wycliffe may be found in Wycliffe, p. xxxi.

years' labour, and an appropriate honour to Wycliffe's University. Thus the Wycliffite translations kept their written form for nigh five hundred years. Froude, indeed, says that, "before the Reformation two versions existed of the Bible in English—one was Wycliffe's, another based on Wycliffe's, but tinted more strongly with the peculiar opinions of the Lollards, followed at the beginning of the fifteenth century.¹ But the second version has no deeper Lollard tint than the first which it revises, removing Anglo-Saxon archaisms with many Latinisms, and giving a more English aspect to the entire translation. The second version must, to a large extent, have superseded the first; and Bishop Pecock, in his "Repressor of the overmuch blaming of the Clergy," a book written about 1449 avowedly against Wycliffe's followers, always uses it in his quotations.² There have been preserved at least one hundred and seventy copies, all of them written before 1430, and they were carefully examined and collated by Forshall and Madden.

One characteristic of Wycliffe's epoch was the spread of education, and in his own period several colleges had been founded—Exeter, Oriel, Queen's, and New College, at Oxford; and Gonville, Trinity Hall, and Corpus Christi at Cambridge. We have referred to the effect produced in course of time by the Norman invasion and other causes, on the older Anglo-Saxon speech. The two races had been at length perfectly united under Edward III, and new mental activity instinctively developed a new outgrowth of expression, filled with life and freshness, and bearing the dew of its youth upon it. One consequence was a double stock of words, Saxon and Norman, so that we possess not a few of that class which are commonly termed synonyms, of which the Anglo-Saxon had almost none.³ While the older tongue keeps its place in our

¹ History of England, vol. iii, p. 77, fourth edition.

² Examples may be seen in the Repressor, vol. I, i, p. 476, &c., ed. Churchill Babington, B.D., London, 1860.

³ Yet Ælfric, in his grammar, managed to translate into Anglo-Saxon such Latin terms as *actio*, *passio*, *modus*, *accidentia*, *conjugatio*, &c., with many other abstract and technical words.

monosyllables, as well as in words denoting objects of sense and relations of domestic and common life, general or abstract terms came from the Latin, and evidently through the Norman when the original spelling is changed. The English kept the predominance, and the Norman fell into a subordinate place. In the conferences that followed the battle of Agincourt, it was ordered by the conqueror that documents should be written in Latin, as his ambassadors did not know French; and writing to the Company of Brewers in London, he assures them that "the English tongue hath in modern days begun to be honorably enlarged and adorned for the better understanding of the people, and that the common idiom is to be exercised in writing." Chaucer, Gower, Mandeville, Trevisa, and Langland were virtually contemporaries. It is very wonderful, and it shows Chaucer's acuteness of philological instinct, that not more than a hundred of his Romance terms have fallen into disuse, though a great many more of his Anglo-Saxon words have perished. He introduced such words as advantage, person, glory, divine, disciples, confound, return, reasonable, renown, vain, victory, &c., and through him and Wycliffe the Midland dialect became standard English. This national language was in Wycliffe's time greatly advanced in growth, having "the blade, the ear, and the corn in the ear," though not in maturity. His English is racy, homely, familiar, and picturesque, the language of his own age, but far simpler and more intelligible than that of Chaucer. Wycliffe translated for the people, not for the aristocracy; for the nation, and not for its more educated nobility. The tongue in currency around him was therefore the fitting vehicle, every-day language for every-day use. His translation is really better in style, more lucid and idiomatic, less tortuous and laboured, than his own original writings, in which he expresses freely, frankly, and vehemently his readiest thoughts when he was writing in his own name in defence of truth, or was inveighing against error, venerable through age or fortified by authority. The quotations in his homilies and tracts agree neither with the first nor the second version. But as a translator he was on his guard in rendering the divine volume into the people's speech, for he was virtually

speaking to the people in the name of the Blessed One.¹ His version has a grandeur unaffected by its quaintness, its familiarity of tone does not in any way derogate from its dignity. Though the stiffness of the Latin text often shines through, the Bible is remarkably free from many of the affectations which abound in contemporary writers. It keeps the old spelling of *him* and *her* for the more modern *them* and *their*, and restricts *th* to the third person singular of verbs, and does not employ it in the plural or in the imperative. The participle that had ended in *-ende* is formed by *-ing*, the prefix *y-* is used in connection with the past participle, the plural of verbs terminates in *-en*, *ye* and *you* are not used as singulars, and the possessive *your* has an objective sense, as in the phrase "your fear and your dread," for the fear of you and the dread of you. "Either" is often a disjunctive, "that ben in erthis, either that ben in heauenis." "Will not" is expressed often, as in Chaucer, by *nyl*, *nold*, *nolden*. The verb *is* is used for yes, as if "is" affirmed the fact, as in James v, 12, "forsothe be your is, is, nay, nay." The marks of punctuation make up for the loss of the earlier inflexions, for they are necessary when the cases have only one form; and some of the persons of the verb are undistinguished by terminations. A synthetic sentence is independent; for principal and secondary clauses, wrought out into a long and complicated paragraph, have their meaning and connection determined by the syntax. But the sense, by means of the points or stops, becomes at once apparent to the eye, without minute analysis, and is not suspended till you come to the last word governing many terms before it. In an uninflected sentence, the meaning depends on the order of the words; and that order, as the grammatical terminations fell into disuse, required nice arrangement.

One is surprised to see how, when Wycliffe's work is modernized in spelling, it so closely resembles subsequent translations in the general aspect of the version, in the flow and

¹ It is strange that Foxe, in his great work, the translation of the long and multifarious history of Bible—a work which sowed the Wycliffe, gives no account of his seeds of the greater Reformation.

position of the words, in the distinctive terms and connecting particles, in the rhythm of its clauses and the mould of its sentences. Several of its phrases must have passed early into the language, especially those which from their currency had acquired a kind of proverbial power, such as "strait gate," and "narrow way" (Matt. vii, 14), "beam and mote" (v, 3), and being adopted by Tyndale, they have kept their place "unto this present." Through these translations the rich and beautiful old English was sanctified for all time, and with many minor variations, not a few of them traceable to the Greek original, it reappears in its essential and characteristic features in the independent translation of Tyndale, which again is so largely retained and embedded in the Authorized Version.

Wycliffe is easily read, though not a few of his words are obsolete. His theological nomenclature, part of which he had learned from Bradwardine, has not been changed to any great extent, and many of the terms, explained in the margin of the MSS. as if needing explanation, are now part of the language, while the explanatory terms have themselves disappeared. Such are *yvil-fame* explained by *schenship*, *libel* by *litel-boke*, *unquieted* by *diseased*. In other cases both the original text and the explanation are still in use, as *affection*, explained by *love*, *benignity* by *goodwill*, *detractors* by *open bakbyters*, *alive* by *quick*. Some renderings are prompted or moulded by the current phrases or customs of his century. The clause 2 Tim. ii, 4, "no man that wareth entangleth himself," he gives as "no man that holdeth knighthood to God inwlapith him silfe," the feudal form of the idea; 2 Kings xv, 20, "and Menahem exacted the money of Israel," he renders, "and Menahem settled the tallage of silver on Israel," tallage being a common term in those days; 1 Peter ii, 13, "be ye suget . . . other to the king, other to dukis; Matt. xxvii, 27, "token Jhesu in the moot hall," a word that came down from remote times. In the same verse the second version has "knights of the justice," and similarly in Luke ii, 2, "Cyrys justice of Syrie," the official title being familiar in England; Judges xx, 28, "provost of the house stood before it (the ark) in those days."

Presbyter he renders by "priest," its contracted form, seniors by "eldre men," and Levite by "deken" (deacon) in Luke x, 32. Pontius Pilate is Pilate of Pounce, then a common form of surname; and he is called meire (mayor) in the first version and "justice" in the second, Matt. xxvii, 2.

It is really amazing that so little of Wycliffe's language has passed away, though many foreign terms torn from his Latin text and thrust into his version never took root. Some of these are apert; balistis, balistæ; calue, bald; cardue, thistle; castel, town; capret, a wild goat; cenefectorie, tent-making; cocco, coccus, scarlet; cirogrille, choirogrillus, hedgehog; colirie, eyesalve; cofin, cophinus, a basket; cultre, knife; cubicularies, chamberlains; diversory, an inn; exces, in the sense of ecstasy; faculty, in the sense of goods, or means and substance; figarde, pygargus, a roebuck; gemmarye, a jeweller; galban, gum; gemels, twins; jument, jumentum, beast of burden; lacert, a lizard; lare, larus, a sea-gull; maal, a fir; margarite, a pearl; nablis, nablum, musical instruments; plaag, plaga, side; proterve, froward; platan, a plane tree; pursirioun, porphyrio, a cormorant; sambuke, sambuka, a musical instrument; sellis, sella, chairs; symulacre, idol; spelonk or spelunk, a cave; stater, a piece of money; symfonie, a musical instrument; sanguyns, blood-coloured; scra-broun, hornet; stable, inn (Luke x, 34); strucioun, an ostrich; sendel, sindon, a linen cloth; sudarie, napkin; universite, world (James iii, 6); veer, spring; volatil, a bird. Comfort is used by him in its literal Latin sense, "And he comforted him (the idol) with nailes"—"fastened him" in the second version (Isai. xli, 7); and in both versions, Philip. iv, 13, "I may alle thingis in him that comforteth," that is strengtheneth me. Not a few of his other Latin terms have perished in the struggle for existence as jecturing, compunct, corumpe, collation (conference), offencioun, defencioun, conspiracioun, coniectynge, repugne, recompensacioun, dignacioun, federed (bound by covenant.) Many of his native or Saxon words have also died out. The following verbs have an active sense which has long since passed away from us:—Afeare, agast, alarge,

bitake (to deliver up), childen, crooken, drunkne, feren, gilden (to sin), honesten, leechen (to heal), lette, longen, meeken, nakenen, nakyn, nighen, noyen, pungeden, richeth, sacren, softeth, sorowen, stithie (to forge), trumpe. Many other like vocables have not come down to us, as—abie, to endure; agregge, to make heavy; biclippe, to embrace; bihete, to promise; buffere, one that stutters; clepe, to call; culver, a dove, found in Spencer; dome, doom, to judge; echen, to add; eren, to plough (earring in the Authorized Version); rich, to enrich; frote, to rub; gab, to lie; gnaste, to creak; grucchen, to murmur; heelden, to pour; herie, to praise; such a phrase as "Takest thou no kepe?" (Luke x, 40). These words have also long ceased to be used:—Knowleche, to confess; lesid, gleaned; oker, to lend on interest; gnappe, to struggle; schende, to confound; stie, to go up; unknowe; alblasters, crossbowmen; buxum¹, obedient; bruk, a locust; comelyng, a stranger; customableness, custom; crasyng, a cleft; ferr-floun, a fugitive; feerly, suddenly; fardel, burden, which occurs in Shakespeare; dwelstere, a female dweller; fraiel, a basket of figs; gelding, a eunuch;² gilteris, sinners; galoun of water, pitcher of water; grisful, grisly; genderers, parents; hatesum, hateful; cheer, countenance ("the cheer of the Lord is upon them," Pet. iii, 12); layner, a garter; leche, a physician (Luke viii, 43, "which hadde spendid all her catel in to lechis"); lovesum; leep, a basket; leasing, lying (occurs in the Authorized Version); lewd, unlearned (the old contrast being lerid and lewid, learned and unlearned); manquellere, a murderer; manassis, threatenings; mesel, a leper; menie, household; mynde, a memorial; more, for elder; nappen, to slumber—Ps. cxx, 4,

¹ In a form of abjuration, 1395, called the gelding—"and Philip and the promise is, I will be buxum to the gelding went down into the water." The literary curiosity was "the law of Holy Church."

² Evelyn notes in his Diary, 11th July, 1654, that, when at Oxford, Barlow, "the bibliothecarius of the Bodleian Library," showed him "gelded man," but preferred chamberlain in his second edition. Bible, wherein the eunuch mentioned to be baptised by Philip is version.

"he (God) shall not nappe, ne slepen"; nol, head or neck; peis, weight; porail, the common people; ripyng, harvest; shamefast, which was originally in the Authorized Version (1 Tim. ii, 9), and ought to have been kept; schrewid, depraved; scheltrun, an army; sothsaw, a proverb; sumdel, partly; scrippe, wallet; shewers, mirrors; sparlyvers, calves of the leg; therf, unleavened; thirs or thrisse, a fabulous beast; toukere, a fuller; welsum, prosperous; unsad, unstable.

But a great number of similar words still survive in Scotch so nearly allied to the Platt-Deutsch and northern English, though they have ceased to occur in ordinary English. Attercop, a spider; axtre, for axletree; baili (Luke xvi, 1), bailie being still the name of a magistrate in a Scotch borough; big, to build, "auld clay biggin" (Burns); beel, suppuration; bylyve, forthwith; birle, (in Scotland to contribute money for drink); birr, force, rush; brokskin, badgerskin, brok being the common name for the animal; brunston, brimstone; chopin, denoting a measure, a word in daily use; dicht, to prepare, applied to the winnowing of grain; draf, well known to keepers of cattle and dairies in Scotland; egge, to edge or push on; fell for skin, "between the fell and the flesh"; gowling, howling; grene for gin, the poacher sets a girn; hyne, a labourer—hind, a common name for farm servants in Berwickshire; croket-rigged, hunchback, shoulders and back being called in old Scotch riggin; cod for pod, "to fill his wame with the coddie the hoggis did ete" (Luke xv, 16); keetling, a whelp, the Scotch familiar word for kitten; kouthly, kouthy, very intimate; rue, to repent; segge, sedge; stithie, anvil, pronounced often study; smekede, smoked; sowel, sowens, a kind of gruel made from the finer flour of oats; tollbooth, prison; puddock, frog; edwite, to upbraid (wite in Scotch signifies blame; the original title of Pecoock's book is "Repressor of the overwyting of the Clergy"); lout (pronounced loot), to stoop; hooled, having the hull or shell taken off; snapere, to stumble; sour-doug, leaven, applied in some parts of Scotland to buttermilk; sowk, suck—Acts xiii, 1, "Manaen that was the sowkyng feere of Eroud" (Herod); sparplyd, sparpled, scattered; stike, stick, to pierce; tunguy, tonguy, talkative; toun, a common name for farm

buildings (Luke xiv, 38, "I have bought a toun"); trows, artificial conduit to serve a mill-wheel; to wauke, to full, so waukmill; wod, mad; yett, gate; yowl, to howl; tak tent, tak heed (Acts xx, 28); wook, week, but now nearly out of use; sled, sledge; slidery, from slide, used for slippery; and speels, meaning chips or splinters. The distinction of genders is well sustained, and both terminations are used, -ster and -ess (issa in mediæval Latin); spouse, spouses; purpuresse, applied to Lydia in Acts xvi; cousyness, a female cousin; discipless; daunstere, or daunceress; sleestere and sleeresse, a female murderer; syngster and syngeress, devouress, servauntess, lecheresse, synneresse, thralesse, weileresse, a female wailer; chesister, cheseresse, a female chooser; leperesse, a female dancer. The feminine termination -ster was beginning, however, to yield, so that sometimes it represents the masculine also. The first version has webstres in a general sense, (1 Kings, xvii, 7), and spinster yet survives, but songster is feminine in Ben Johnson; songster-ess being a double feminine. We also richness, richnessis in the plural; almesse, almessis. Some adjectives of material have not been retained. We still possess, however, golden, brazen, wooden, flaxen, woolen, but Wycliffe has silvern, reeden, treen, stonen, hairren, bricken, hornen, &c.

Wycliffe had great wealth of compound words, though very many have not survived. His prefixes are—above-, after- (which he couples with forty different words), again- (Titus iii. 6, 5 "bi waischyng of agen bigetyng and agen newying of the Hooli Goost"), at-, alto-, before- (which he couples with thirty-two different words), bi-, dis-, en-, even-, ever-, for-, fore-, ful-, in-, mel-, mis-, o-, if-, on-, over-, out-, through-, to-, un-, under-, up-, with-. There was the less difficulty in translating when words could be so easily coined, and compounds were of the genius of the Saxon language. If a distinctive word for things having life could not be found, then soul-havers was at hand; if helm meant a warlike headpiece, then steer-staff might be used for the instrument that guides a ship; erthe-movynge is an earthquake.

And yet a slight change of spelling gives many of Wycliffe's

words a modern aspect — abaished, abashed; aish, ashes; abregge, abridge; abite, habit; axe, ask; brid, bird; brisse, bruise; breste, burst; bigge, buy; bocherie, shambles; boyschel, bushel; bottler, butler; brenne, burn; caitiff, captive; coryour, currier; coz, kiss; drede, dread; falt, fauld, folded; gree, degree; hole, whole; carkeis, carcass; hoxe, hough; ligge, lie; parfyte, perfect; pistil, epistle; raied, arrayed; rede, read; scrowis, scrolls; suget, subject; snybbe, snub, reprove; sorwe, sorrow; spitele, hospital; treede, tread; weilen, to wail; wilden, to weild; wlaten, to loathe; yuel, evil; wrethen, wreath; "tweye minutis," "two mites," the second word being only the contraction of the former (Mark xii, 42). Not many years ago when the experiment of reading Wycliffe's translation aloud was tried in Yorkshire, there was hardly a word or an expression which seemed at all peculiar.¹

¹ The statement is given in the 1856, and is said to rest on the Christian Annotator, vol. III, p. 58, authority of Dr. Tregellea.

CHAPTER IV.

THE Bible in the "modir tongue" must have been speedily diffused, at first in fragments copied and carried through the country by Wycliffe's poor priests, and many other agents. Without such a circulation the first version could not have made the impression ascribed to it before the Reformer's death, and it could only have been completed shortly before that event. Among these poor priests Swinderby was noted for preaching any where and at any time; his pulpit on one occasion being set between two millstones. Those preachers also, according to Knyghton, or pseudo-Knyghton, maintained stoutly that they were true evangelists, because they possessed "the Gospel" or English Bible. The manuscripts remaining are, of course, only a very small remnant, and most of them seem to have been written within forty years of its publication, or between 1420 and 1450. The handsome appearance of many of them shows that the wealthier classes appreciated them, and that the scribes who bestowed such time and skill on them felt assured of disposing of their labour at a good remuneration. There was a great demand, and a corresponding supply. Among Wycliffe's followers there were not a few knights and "soldiers, with dukes and earls,"—the strenuous supporters and defenders of the new sect, according to Knyghton, and that sect, "like suckers growing out of the root of a tree, filled every place within the compass of the land," and brought over to it "the greater part of the people." "Both men and women," he adds, on turning Wycliffites, "became too eloquent and too much for other people by word of mouth, and they all expressed profound respect for Goddis law" or the English Bible

Therefore there were copies not only in folio and quarto for the higher classes, but there were copies also of a smaller size; and, indeed, nearly all of those extant are of this last kind, meant not for a place of honour in a library, but for individual daily consultation. But it need not surprise us that so few MSS. have come down to our time. Many must have perished from use, others were destroyed in a season of panic, or injured by the means taken to conceal or preserve them, and not a few were burned, as the most unscrupulous measures were taken to suppress the version.

Many of these written Bibles are of great interest from the persons who had them, and the dates, curious notes, and references found in them. Lewis refers to a copy of the New Testament in Emmanuel College, Cambridge, which has on a spare leaf at the end—"Finished 1382, this copy taken 1397." There is one in the library of Cambridge University, written about 1430, which, along with some personal allusions, has a note amidst rich ornamentation—"The true copy of a prologe which John Wycliffe wrote to this Bible, which he translated into English about two hundred years past; that was in the tyme of Kinge Edwarde the Thyrd, as may justly be gathered of the mention that is had of him in divers ancient cronicles, Anno Domini 1550." Upon the second of two inserted leaves of vellum is printed in large capitals of gold, *Edoverdus Sextus*; this Bible may have belonged to the young king who died in 1553. In the library of Westminster Abbey there is another copy, written about 1450, given by the Duchess of Richmond to Henry, Earl of Arundel, and by him, in September, 1576, to Richard Wiclif. Another MS. in the old library of the British Museum, in two volumes, is very neatly and carefully written, probably before 1420; it has also been diligently gone over by another and nearly contemporary reviser, and is the second text of the edition so well printed by Forshall and Madden. A copy, belonging to Mr. Bannister, of the Inner Temple, has on the first page, in an old hand of the fifteenth century, an inscription showing that probably it belonged to the Duke of Gloucester, Richard the Third. Another is also said to have belonged to Duke Humphrey, another to Henry VI, who gave

it to the Charterhouse, another to Henry VII, and one was also given by her chaplain to Queen Elizabeth as a birth-day present. In the Wardrobe Accounts of Edward IV, there are entries for binding his Titus Livius, his Froissart, his Josephus, and his Bible.

Wycliffe's work as a translator brought upon him special hostility, for the idea of an English Bible filled the clergy with alarm and indignation. He knew, as he tells us, that the priests declared it to be "heresy to speak of the Holy Scriptures in English," and he adds in his Wicket that "such a charge is a condemnation of the Holy Ghost, who first gave the Scriptures in tongues to the Apostles of Christ, to speak that word in all languages that were ordained of God under heaven." He boldly dared to say of Courtenay, self-named "Chief Inquisitor," that the episcopal prosecution of some of his followers had its origin in this—"because God's law was written in English to lewd men"—"He pursueth a certain priest because he writeth to men in English," the allusion being probably to Hereford. Knyghton, the able and well-known canon of Leicester, thus delivers himself: "This Master John Wycliffe translated it out of the Latin into the Anglican, not the Angelic tongue, and thus laid it more open to the laity and to women who could read, than it had formerly been to the most learned of the clergy—even to those of them that had the best understanding. And in this way the Gospel pearl is cast abroad, and trodden under foot of swine; that which was before precious both to clergy and laity is rendered as it were the common jest of both. The jewel of the Church is turned into the common sport of the people, and what was hitherto the principal gift of the clergy and divines is made for ever common to the laity."

Sudbury and Courtenay, the two highest ecclesiastics, who were from their position obliged to take action against Wycliffe, had not the smallest pretensions to scholarship or to a knowledge of theology. Nor had Arundel,¹ who had been so instru-

¹ To create a vacancy in Canterbury, St. Andrews, a transference which Pope Boniface IX pitched he indignantly repudiated. He has Arundel into the Scottish see of however, a peculiar connection with VOL. I. F

mental in dethroning one king and setting up another in his room, any higher qualification; but he could lose his temper, and say to Thorpe, "a poor priest," when under examination, "By God, I shall set upon thy shins a pair of pearls, that thou shalt be glad to change the voice." He had presented to the Pope a list of 267 errors and heresies out of the writings of the Reformer; and he had sunk so low in his ecclesiastical enmities as to present a request that his holiness would order Wycliffe's body to be exhumed, taken out of consecrated ground and buried in a dunghill. The Pope, however, declined to command this posthumous degradation. But the Council of Constance, which burned Huss and Jerome, met in 1415, and condemned both the writings and the bones of Wycliffe to the flames; and in 1428, fourteen years after Arundel's death, the decree was carried out in the primacy of Chichele, and under Bishop Richard Flemmyng of Lincoln, in earlier days himself, like his predecessor in the same see, a keen Wycliffite. His remains were solemnly "ungraved," and, in the oft-quoted words of Fuller, "they took what was left of his bones, and burned them to ashes, and cast them into the Swift, a neighbouring brook running hard by. Thus this brook hath conveyed his ashes into Avon, Avon into Severn, Severn into the narrow seas, they

Scotland. His family, named Alan, France, and in the infirmity of the came over with the Conqueror in French alphabet. In 1405 Henry 1066. Of the first Alan's two sons, IV kidnapped the Prince of Scotland, afterwards James I, and wandered north into Scotland, and Arundel might have recognized in purchased of the Scottish king the the prisoner so long kept in captivity hereditary office of High Steward. a "nineteenth" Scotch cousin. Lord One of his descendants, the sixth of Campbell (*Lives of the Chancellors*, vol X, p. 312, 4th edition) commits the family who had held the office, wedded Marjory, only child of a strange blunder when he assigns Robert Bruce by his first marriage, Archbishop Arundel's chancellorship and their only child Robert, High to the Wars of the Roses; for the Steward and Regent, succeeding first of the thirteen battles was his uncle, David II, in 1370, became fought in May, 1455, and Arundel Robert II, the first of the Steward died in February, 1414. Arundel, or Stewart dynasty, the popular five times Chancellor, could have form Stuart having its origin in little leisure to study theology.

into the main ocean. And thus the ashes of Wycliffe are the emblem of his doctrine, which now is dispersed all the world over."

The posthumous indignity done to Wycliffe was paralleled in 1538, when, by a writ *Quo Warranto*, Becket was formally summoned, and, after he had been dis canonized, his shrine was profaned and demolished, and its costly ornaments of gold and precious stones were removed. Not only so, but the bones of the Saint, which had attracted myriads of devotees for so many years, were plucked from their resting-place, burned to ashes, and scattered to the four winds of heaven. This deed of spoliation gave a greater shock to Europe than the execution of Fisher and More.

But while Wycliffe, who seems to have expected martyrdom, escaped himself so marvellously from the grasp of his enemies, persecution of uncommon severity fell upon his followers, who had waxed so formidable from their possession of an English Bible. He had said in his lifetime, "The friars pursue priests, for they reprove their sins as God bids, to brenne them and the Gospel of Christ written in English to most learning of our nation."¹ Purvey had also divined coming peril, and in the conclusion of his Prologue had prayed that "God would grant us all grace to have well and keep well Holy Writ, and to suffer joyfully some pain for it at the last." In 1387 he, Hereford, and Ashton were forbidden to preach in his diocese by the Bishop of Worcester. Commissions were issued on the 30th March and 16th April, 1388, to seize the writings of Wycliffe and Hereford, and they were repeated several times in that and the following year. In 1391 a bill was brought into Parliament to forbid the circulation of the English Scriptures; but it was rejected through the influence of the Duke of Lancaster, who answered "right sharply, we will not be the refuse of all other nations; for since they have God's law, which is the law of our belief, in their own language, we will have ours in English whoever say nay. And this he affirmed with a great oath." Knyghton, in an account of Archbishop Courtenay's visita-

¹ Treatise against the Order of Friars, cap. 36.

tion of Leicester in 1392, describes a man called William Smith as compelled to do penance in the market-place, and to deliver up English copies of the Gospels and Epistles which he had written, and the culprit confessed that for eight years he had diligently employed himself in such transcriptions.

Various conjectures have been made with regard to the origin of the term Lollard, so familiarly given to Wycliffe's followers. Some suppose it to have been derived from Walter Lollard, who was burned at Cologne in the fourteenth century. Others derive it from *lollen* or *lullen*, to sing with a low voice.¹ From the title of Netter de Walden's book (*Fasciculi Zizaniorum*), it would seem that in England it was supposed to come from *lollium*, tares, as opposed to the true wheat; and Knyghton describes Wycliffe as mingling tares with wheat in his sermons. A similar allusion occurs in a Bull of Gregory XI, sent to Oxford, lamenting that by Wycliffe tares were allowed to spring up among the wheat. The doctrines themselves are also called Lollards. Gower, an anti-Lollard, and Chaucer, a sympathizer, also seem to refer to this origin of the term. The name had already been applied to the Beghards of the Netherlands, to the Cellites of Antwerp, and to the brethren of the "Free Spirit." In *Piers the Ploughman's Crede*, it is said of Wycliffe's opponents that they "overal lollede him," accused him of lolling—a loller meaning a sluggard; and in the *Complaint of the Ploughman* the term loller is given to the friars.

Arguments against Lollardism and the turning of the Bible into the mother tongue were quite legitimate as a free expression of opinion, and works and fragments of works against translation are still in existence. John of Bromyard (a small town in Herefordshire), a theologian of Cambridge, and a Doctor of Laws, was noted about 1390 as a resolute opponent of Wycliffe and his views. Capgrave, Knyghton, Wodeford, Walden, and Walsingham, all of them able and learned divines, threw themselves into the great controversy with characteristic keenness and power. Reginald Pecock, Bishop of Chichester, in his "Repressor" (1449), presents a very able and strange combina-

¹ Du Cange, *sub voce*.

tion of what now would be called rationalism and ultramontanism. Those whom he defended so gallantly against the Bible men, met in Council, Archbishop Bourchier and Bishop Waynflete being present, and not only spurned him as a heretic, but condemned him to degradation and confinement; and to the end of his life he was a prisoner in the Abbey of Thorny in Cambridgeshire, ink and paper being denied him. His rationalism was provoked, and so far justified, by the application of Scripture on the part of the Lollards to uses which it was neither fitted nor intended to serve; and he analyzes and condemns the three "Trowings" of the "pulpit bawlers" on these points. His ultramontane leanings are modified, however, by his repudiation of "fire, sword, and hangment" as means of conversion, and by the avowal of his intense desire, that "Scripture were lerned of the comon people in their modir language."

If some of the Lollards cherished extreme political views, or propounded socialist notions, it is strange that in the legislative measures taken against them, they are stigmatized, not as traitors and anarchists, but as religious heretics. The *Act de Heretico Comburendo* (2 Henry IV, cap. 15), passed in 1401, speaks of "divers false and perverse people of a new sect; they make unlawful conventicles, they hold and exercise schools, and make and write books." The books must have included the English Bible, from which the innovators drew their courage and strength; but it seems to be classed with other productions, as if it had been profane to call an English version by the same appellation as would be conferred on the Latin Vulgate. The allusion in the statute to civil riots and discontent is only secondary and subordinate. By this Act, the lives of the subjects were put under the control of the bishops, who got power to fine and imprison all heretics, and all possessors of heretical books, while obstinate and lapsed heretics were handed over to the sheriff, to be burned at once, "in a high place before the people, that they might take salutary warning." The Act bears the title—"The Orthodoxy of the Faith of the Church of England asserted, and provision made against oppugners of the same, with the punishment of

hereticks."¹ The church was now dominant, and the civil power was bound to execute without hesitation or loss of time the bishop's sentence. Offenders were at once thrust beyond the protection of the common law, and the prelates were forced to have prisons of their own. A similar law had been made in Germany in 1244 by Frederick II; but Louis would not permit its enactment in France. The common belief asserted by Foxe, Burnet, and Collier, that the Act de Heretico Comburendo was an entire novelty in the law of England, does not seem to rest on good foundation. The Act itself presupposes the existence of its penalty, and only ordains that it be inflicted *uberius et celerius*, "more fully and more swiftly." The earlier civil law of England, it would seem, had sometimes taken cognizance of heresy as a crime. Bale notes, from a London Chronicle, that an Albigenian was burned in London in 1210.² Bracton³ tells of a deacon burned at Oxford in 1223, for having gone over to Judaism from love of a Jewess, and getting himself "circumcided." And in his laws of England, a treatise written about the end of the reign of Henry III, he mentions burning as the punishment of heresy. It is stated in the Chronicle of Meaux,⁴ that in 1303 fifty men and eight women were burned in England. In Piers the Ploughman's Crede, the friars are accused of executing heretics, "First to brenne the bodye in a bale of fire." But such an old law had long been obsolete, and no death warrant would have been issued on a mere ecclesiastical sentence.

Though such penalties may have been inflicted on heretics at an early time, the punishment was only occasional, and the civil law intervened; but, now, a simple decree of a bishop sufficed to send a man to the stake, and the accusation of heresy became sufficiently elastic to bring within it a considerable variety of offenders.⁵ "The Commons petitioned for a mitigation of the terms of the Act, but the royal reply was,

¹ Coram populo in eminenti loco.
The Act did not remain a dead letter.

² Cent. lxiii, c. 65.

³ De Legibus Angliæ, folio, 124.

⁴ Bond's edition, vol. ii, p. 323.

⁵ Coke, Institutes, pt. iii. Coke maintains "that the man who has the soul's leprosy, being convicted of heresy, should be cut off."

that the law should be made more severe.¹ This statute was apparently passed by Parliament at the instigation of the clergy, led by Archbishop Arundel, who had a special claim on the Sovereign, for he had been, as much from motives of a personal as of a patriotic nature, a chief adviser and actor in deposing the weak and capricious Richard II, and securing the throne to Henry IV. He was, besides, a near relation by blood of the king, his mother being the daughter of Henry Plantagenet, Earl of Lancaster. Feeling his infirmity of title, and his obligation to his cousin the primate and to the church, the king, in the first year of his reign, announced to the clergy his determination to support them against any threatened aggression, and to co-operate with them in the extirpation of heresy. In the second year of his reign, Sautre, priest of St. Osyth, London,² was sent to the stake, and Bradbee, an uneducated tailor, but "really a great man," as Dean Hook calls him, was roasted in a barrel, a portion of the process being endured in the presence of the Prince of Wales, soon to be Henry V. Occleve, an orthodox and frigid poet³ (born about 1370), sings of this terrible martyrdom, but with no sympathy for the poor sufferer. Another minor bard, Lydgate, ordained priest in 1397, and patronized by Henry V, though he lived in the midst of the Lollard agitation, does not seem to have committed himself in any way. Thirty of the more prominent Lollards were put to death at various times, and without mercy. Then followed, on Christmas, 1417, the terrible execution of Oldcastle, Lord Cobham,⁴ "a person," in the language of Lord Brougham,

¹ See remarks of Lord Brougham on this statute in his "England and France under the House of Lancaster." London, 1861.

² The church, situated on the north side of St. Pancras Lane, was burned at the great fire, and the parish was united to that of St. Stephen Walbrook.

³ De Regimine Principum, Introduction.

⁴ Cobham had, in 1410, introduced

a Bill to confiscate the revenues of the church, which, after some calculations, goes on to say that, over and above the said sum of 322,000 marks, the result of appropriation, several houses of religion possessed as many temporalities as might suffice 15,000 priests, every priest to be allowed for his stipend seven marks a year. Hook's Archbishops, vol. IV, p. 489.

"of extraordinary virtue and high rank, a knight greatly distinguished in the wars, a gentleman of unsullied reputation for honour, the head of an ancient house, and by right of marriage a peer of the realm."¹ His enthusiasm may have led himself or incited his followers to some political indiscretions. His was a death of savage cruelty, for he was hung in chains as a traitor, in order to be burned at the same time as a heretic. Horace Walpole says of him that, "his virtue made him a reformer, and his valour made him a martyr." There were other executions under this disgraceful Act, of which little record has come down to us; for we find Henry V restoring forfeited property to the widows of four persons, who had been martyred before his accession.

The clergy were devotedly loyal to their protector. When, after the accession of Henry IV, an insurrection in favour of Richard had been put down at Cirencester, and the head of one of its promoters, the Earl of Salisbury, a noted Lollard, was carried into London in triumph, the procession was met by eighteen bishops, and thirty-two mitred abbots in full robes, and chanting *Te Deum*. By a statute of the fifth year of Richard II (5 Rich. II, cap. 5), confirmed by another of the second of Henry V (2 Henry V, cap. 7), it was ordained to be part of the oath administered to a sheriff on his acceptance of office, that he should "seek and suppress the errors and heresies commonly called Lolleries." This portion of the oath continued in use till Sir Edward Coke objected to it, when he was, in 1626, by a court intrigue to keep him out of Parliament, appointed Sheriff of Buckinghamshire,—his defence being that it was an oath to suppress the Established Church, as Lollard was only another name for Protestant.

Yet what Parliament might not venture to do, was done in its own way by a Convocation which met at Oxford, in July, 1408, and Arundel was its moving spirit. But the opposition

¹ Shakespeare had used his name a martyr, and this is not the man. in Henry IV, First Part, "my old A line of limping metre in the last lad of the Castle," but afterwards, passage of Act ii, Sc. 3, is the result of the change of name from he made apology—"Oldcastle died Oldcastle to Falstaff.

was so strong, that the Constitutions were not promulgated till after another Convocation, held at St. Paul's, in January of the following year. The new English Bible was directly struck at in the seventh Constitution, to which passage reference has already been made: "We therefore decree and ordain that no man shall, hereafter, by his own authority, translate any text of the Scripture into English, or any other tongue, by way of a book, libel, or treatise, now lately set forth in the time of John Wyckliff, or since, or hereafter to be set forth, in part or in whole, privily or apertly, upon pain of greater excommunication, until the said translation be allowed by the ordinary of the place, or, if the case so require, by the council provincial."¹ Some authors have tried to apologize, on political grounds, for this audacious suppression of an English Bible by the English clergy; but the "Constitution" itself, resting solely on ecclesiastical bases, assigns no reason of the kind.² Sir Thomas More, at a later period, records that Caxton did not print Wyckliffe's translation because Arundel's statute would bring him under penalty for issuing an English Bible.³

In 1404 and 1407, the Commons, who certainly were not all Lollards, addressed the king on the enormous wealth of the church; for half the land of England belonged to it and to the religious houses: but he at once forbade them to discuss such matters. In the second parliament of Henry V, in 1414, the legislature joined in asking for harder measures against the Lollards, perhaps on account of political opinions. After a suspected rising of the Lollards, a law was passed, declaring that all who read the Scriptures in the mother tongue should "forfeit land, catel, lif, and goods, from theyr heyres for ever." But there was also in this parliament a revival of the desire to secure for the revenue of the state some portion of the exorbitant property

¹ Wilkin's Concilia, vol. III, p. 317.

There had been an earlier canon passed at the Council of Thoulouse, in 1229, forbidding the possession of the Scriptures to the laity, and strictly forbidding translations.

² The Bishop of Worcester, in 1387, told his clergy that the Lollards were followers of Mahomet. Wilkin's Concilia, vol. III, p. 202.

³ Cronica de Event. Angliæ, tom II, London, 1652, p. 2644.

of the church. This desire was apparently cherished by many loyal and patriotic churchmen; and, according to a common report which Shakespeare has immortalized, Archbishop Chichele stirred up the king to undertake at once the threatened invasion of France, and in this way to draw the attention of the people away from schemes of ecclesiastical reform. The poet makes Chichele say to the Bishop of Ely:—

“That self same bill is urged
That, in the eleventh year of the last king’s reign,
Was like, and had, indeed, against us passed,
But that the scrambling and unquiet time
Did push it out of further question. . . .
. . . . If it pass against us,
We lose the better half of our possessions.”

The statement as given by Halle, Holinshed, Fabyan, and others, that the clergy suggested the war, and argued the king into compliance, may perhaps be regarded as an exaggeration; but they fanned the flame, if they did not kindle it. This war, which was in unison with the late king’s policy, was utterly unjust; for the claim of Edward III devolved on the Earl of March, his lineal heir, and not on the usurping house of Lancaster. Every one knows that the campaign created the greatest enthusiasm, for the wonderful battle of Agincourt threw unsurpassed glory round the English hero—a glory that sometimes dazzles those who have little sympathy with the claims or conquests of Henry V.

The English Bible, circulated, expounded, quoted, and applied, filled the ecclesiastics with terror. To have it, or to be accused of having it, put a man, by law, into extreme jeopardy. But the word of the Lord was not thrown away or lost. Those who felt it to be their enlightenment and comfort cherished it with intense veneration. The danger which they incurred in keeping it only enhanced its value, for there was a possible martyrdom behind it; and there might have been embossed on its boards the effigy of a stake and a chain, a fire and a victim. The great majority of the Wycliffite Scriptures still preserved were written after the ban of Arundel and his Convocation had

been issued. Those who read the forbidden volume must have felt the proverb verified in its richest and truest sense, “Stolen waters are sweet, and bread eaten in secret is pleasant.” Many did suffer for owning a Bible in their spoken tongue. Foxe¹ gives numerous instances of persecution in various dioceses. Some persons were imprisoned, and others were burned. In 1519, six men and a woman perished at the stake at Coventry, for teaching their children the Lord’s Prayer and the Ten Commandments in English. The point of the charge against the “examinates,” or accused persons, was uniformly not the possession of a Bible, but of an English Bible, or “book of the New Law in English.” An unintelligible Latin volume of Scripture was felt to be harmless in the hands of the people, though, indeed, William Butler,² a Franciscan adversary of Wycliffe, hesitates not to say, “The prelates ought not to allow that any person should read the Scripture translated into Latin at pleasure.”³ There was a great desire that children should not be taught the Lord’s Prayer or the Beatitudes in English. Some of the people had not the whole New Testament, but only the Gospels or a few of the Epistles. The forbidden book was often read by night, and those who had not been themselves educated listened with eagerness to the reading of others; but to read it, and to hear it read, were alike forbidden. Copies of the New Testament were also borrowed from hand to hand through a wide circle, and poor people gathered their pennies and formed copartneries for the purchase of the sacred volume. Those who could afford it gave five marks for the coveted manuscript (about £40 sterling), and others in their penury gave

¹ In vols. IV and V. Seeley, London. ment was published, says, “I fear two things—I fear that the study of

² Vaughan’s Wycliffe, vol. II, p. 50. Latin Bibles were so scarce that Fitzralph, primate of Armagh, complained to Pope Innocent that four of his chaplains, on going to Oxford, could not find a Bible. Hebrew will promote Judaism, and that the study of philology will revive paganism.” There was some ground for the fears of Erasmus, for it was said of some of the Italian scholars, who had become classic

³ More than a century afterwards, Erasmus, in 1516, the year in which his first edition of Greek New Testa- pagans, that they had a chaunt, “Come, let us sing a new song unto Pope Sixtus.”

gladly for a few leaves of St. Peter and St. Paul a load of hay. Nicholas Bulward, of the diocese of Norwich, was charged "that he hath a New Testament which he bought in London for four marks and fourty pence." John Colins and his wife were brought up for buying a Bible of Stacey for twenty shillings. In 1429 the price of a Bible was £2, 16s. 8d.—a great price, and probably more than twelve times that sum in our current money; but fragments in separate books would be proportionately cheaper. Some committed portions to memory, that they might recite them to relatives and friends. Thus Alice Colins was commonly sent for to the meetings, "to recite unto them the Ten Commandments and the Epistles of Peter and James." "Understandest thou what thou readest?" was a challenge wholly fruitless to many; but they enjoyed the benediction, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy." In 1429 Marjery Backster was indicted because she asked her maid Joan to "come and hear her husband read the law of Christ out of a book he was wont to read by night." Richard Hun, committed to the Lollard's Tower in 1514, was found dead in his cell, there being strong suspicions that he had been murdered. His indictment before his death bore that he "had in his keeping divers English books prohibited and damned by the law, as the Apocalypse in English, and Epistles and Gospels in English." One of the "new articles" brought against him after his death was "that he defendeth the translation of the Bible and of the Holy Scripture into English." Between 1518 and 1521, such cases are recorded as Richard Collins, accused of having a book of Luke and of Paul; William Pope, of having a book of Paul and a book of small Epistles; Stacey, brickmaker, Coleman Street, of having a book of the Apocalypse; Thomas Colins, of having a book of Paul and of James in English; and John Ledishall, of Hungerford, reading the Bible at Burford upon Holyrood day; and John Heron of having "a book of the exposition of the Gospels fairly written in English."

The means employed to discover the readers and possessors of Scripture were truly execrable in character. Friends and

relations were put on oath, and bound to say what they knew of their own kindred. The privacy of the household was violated through this espionage; and husband and wife, parent and child, were sworn against one another. The ties of blood were wronged, and the confidence of friendship was turned into a snare in this secret service. Universal suspicion must have been created; no one could tell who his accuser might be, for the friend to whom he had read of Christ's betrayal might soon be tempted to act the part of Judas towards himself, and for some paltry consideration sell his life to the ecclesiastical powers. There are numerous examples. Robert Colins "detected" or informed against Richard Colins of Girge, for that Richard did read unto him the Ten Commandments, and taught him the Epistle of James; John Hakker detected Thomas Vincent for giving him the Gospel of St. Matthew in English; John Steventon detected Alice Colins for teaching the Ten Commandments and the first chapter of St. John in English; Thomas Colins informed against his "own natural father," because his father had taught him the Ten Commandments; Robert Pope informed against his wife, his son, and his father, the paternal crime being that his parent had listened to the reading of the Gospel of Matthew. Many from experience must have become so cunning as to escape detection, and others may have secured immunity by an organized system of vigilant sentinels, and private tokens and watchwords. On being seized many abjured. In 1519 Roger Parker of Hitchenden said to John Phip, that "for burning his books he was foul to blame, for they were worth a hundred marks. To whom John answered, that he had rather burn his books than that his books should burn him." On one occasion, at Amersham, in 1506, the daughter of the martyr William Tyllsworth was "compelled with her own hands to set fire to her dear father." Foxe intimates that when he wrote the story, there were persons alive who had witnessed such a refinement of cruelty. When John Scrivener was burned, his children were forced to light the fire that consumed him.

The attachment of the Wycliffites to Scripture was notorious

all through the previous century, and from their first existence. An old satirical song complains of Lord Cobham—

“Hit is unkyndly for a knight,
That should a kinges castel kepe,
To babble the Bibel day and night.”

Their earlier purity of conversation is brought out by Chaucer in his *Canterbury Tales*. The host adjures the parson, “for Goddes bones,” to tell a story in his turn; but the parson’s surprise at the sinful oath at once marked him out as a Lollard—“I smell a Loller in the wind.” To prevent him from talking Gospel, the shipman struck in, “He shall no Gospel glossen here, nor preach, or he might springen cockle in our cleane corn,” an allusion to *lolium* (tares). The parson’s tale, however, is in character, being a long sermon filled with quotations from Scripture, the Latin clauses being rendered by the poet himself.

The knowledge of divine truth, received by the reading of the Scriptures, was transmitted by a succession of pious men for more than a century after Wycliffe’s death. There was a revival of spiritual life, and the dim mists of the morning were passing away at the rising of the sun. Readers of the manuscript Bible were numerous in London, where they had several places of meeting; and they abounded also in the counties of Lincoln, Essex, Norfolk, Suffolk, Buckingham, and Hereford. The Gospels, especially that of Matthew, the Beatitudes, the Apocalypse, and very frequently the Epistle of James, are mentioned in the informations and indictments. In 1528, John Tyball, of Steeple Bumstead, confessed to having part of Paul’s Epistles after the old translation. John Pykas, in 1529, acknowledged that he had a manuscript of the Bible, and that he had been studying it since 1512. About 1520 and 1521, more than five hundred men and women were arrested in the one diocese of Lincoln, under Bishop Longland; and there was persecution from 1509 to 1517 under Fitzjames, Bishop of London. Ammonius, the Latin secretary of Henry VIII, writes in grim humour to Erasmus, in 1511, that so many heretics had been burned under Bishop Fitzjames that in and around

London fuel had become scarce and dear.¹ In 1529, John Tewksbury, citizen and leather merchant, on examination before Bishop Tunstall, deposed that he had been studying the Scripture for seventeen years, and had a copy of the “Bible written.” These Bible readers called themselves “brothers” or “sisters” in Christ, and at an early period they took the name of “just-fast men,” “known men,” and “known women.” The title was based, according to Reginald Pecock, on Wycliffe’s unhappy misrendering of the last clause of 1 Corinthians xiv, 38, “If eny man unknowith he schal be unknown,” Pecock’s explanation being that they understood the clause to mean that if a man did not know the New Testament, he should be unrecognized of God “for to be eny of hise.” In talking of a third party, one would ask, “Is he a known man?”—that is, Is he one of the party characterized by their reading of the written New Testament? But such stealth and secrecy were forced upon them—“the Word of the Lord was precious in those days, there was no open vision,”—and the time was yet distant when the circulation and reading of Scripture should be without bar or proscription, when there should be an Authorized Version. In consequence of the spirit of earnest inquiry which was shed abroad, the tyranny of the spirituality was seen to be more glaringly in antagonism with inspired teaching.

In fine, there is no doubt that “this dear old English Bible” kept alive the knowledge of divine truth for many years. The influence of Wycliffe had not ceased when that of Tyndale began, for in 1529, and in the fierce proclamation of that year against heretical books—Tyndale’s Testament occupying the first place on the list—all civil officers are enjoined at the same time to “destroy all heresies and errors commonly called Lollardies.” Wycliffe’s followers were therefore still of such note and influence as to obtain a place in this royal document. Even so far on as 1538, Lambert the martyr, in reply to one of the articles preferred against him, admitted, “I did once see a book of the New Testament, which was not written in my estimation this hundred years, and in my mind right well translated after the example of that which is read in the Church in Latin.”

¹ Epist., cxxvii.

Vernacular translations of Scripture were usually found in connection with the reformed doctrines, and Scotland was no exception. In 1408, John Resby, a follower of Wycliffe, who had strayed down to the North, was arrested and tried under the Regency of Albany, and, being convicted of forty heresies, was burned at Perth. The Abbot of Inchcolm, as continuator of Fordun's Chronicle, tells the story, and he laments that the books of Wycliffe are possessed by several Lollards in Scotland, and kept with profound and "devilish" secrecy. The same chronicler relates that, in 1431, Paul Craws or Cwar, a Bohemian Wycliffite, was convicted and burned at St. Andrews. Such had been the increase of Lollardy, and such the dread of it, that the Scottish Parliament, meeting at Perth, in the reign of James I, passed on the 12th of March, 1424-5, an "Act of Heretickis and Lollardis." "Item, Anentis Heretickis and Lollardis, that ilk Bischop sall ger inquyr be the Inquisicione of Heresy, quhar ony sik beis fundyne, ande that thai be punyst as Laive of Haly Kirk requiris; Ande, gif it misteris (if there be need) that secular power be callyt tharto in suppowale and helping of Haly Kirk."¹ An inquisitor had also been appointed, the first who held the office being Laurence of Lindores, Abbot of Scone, in 1411, and the first Professor of Law in the newly established University of St. Andrews. It was enacted by this University in 1416 that all who commenced Master of Arts should solemnly swear to resist the Lollards. At an earlier period, in 1390, a Scottish book was written against the disciples of Wycliffe. In 1494, Robert Blackadder, Bishop of Glasgow, and first Archbishop, "delated" some thirty individuals of good family—squires with considerable property—principally from Kyle, the central district of Ayrshire; and Lollards of Kyle became their common designation. Being convicted by the ecclesiastical courts of thirty-four heresies, they were sent up to the civil authorities, but they declined to interfere. One of the culprits, Campbell of Cessnock, had a priest at home "who read the Bible to them in their vernacular." Campbell, feeling himself in danger, appealed to the king, and his wife made an eloquent defence.

¹ Acta Parl. Scotiæ, vol. II, p. 7.

James IV at once acquitted the whole party, and, as Knox adds, "the greatest part of the accusation was turned to lawchter."

There is little doubt that Wycliffe's version was in quiet circulation in several parts of the northern country. Its language was quite intelligible in those days to Scottish readers, for it was virtually their own. Those who could read Fordun's Scoti-Chronicon, Archdeacon Barbour's Bruce, or Blind Harry's Wallace; or the Oryginal Cronykil of Wyntoun, Prior of St. Serf, or the King's Quhair of James Prince of Scotland, could easily read Wycliffe. Barbour calls his own language "English"; and one of his contemporaries thanks Chaucer for improving "our tongue." Barbour has *-and* often for the termination of the participle, though he uses also *-ing*. He is in some things more modern than Chaucer, for he has *they*, *their*, *them*, while the English poet keeps the older forms of the pronouns. These works were written in a dialect that reached from the Trent and Humber through Lothian and the East of Scotland to the Moray Firth, and it is the language of the Cursor Mundi, of Hampole and of his "Pricke of Conscience."

In a volume of English Metrical Homilies of the fourteenth century, edited by Mr. Small from manuscript (Edin., 1862), the style is a quarter of a century earlier than Wycliffe, and there are several allusions to the right of the people to have and read the Bible in English—

"For al men can noht, I wis,
Understand Latin and Frankis."

The language of these Homilies is the Dano-Saxon of the North of England, the same as the earlier literary language of Scotland. The translation of Virgil by Gawaine Douglas,¹ Bishop of Dunkeld, is called by L'Isle, the Anglo-Saxon grammarian, "Virgil Scottished"; but the poet Dunbar describes the noble translator soon after his death as being "in our *English* rhetoric the rose."

An account of the examination of William Thorpe, "the poor

¹ The poet was the third son of his patron saint that no son of his old grim "Bell the Cat," fourth but Gawaine could write a line. Earl of Angus, who used to thank

priest," before Archbishop Arundel, at the Castle of Saltwood, in 1407, was written by himself, and afterwards published with an advertisement to the reader by Tyndale, who intimates that he had modernized the older style "for our southern men," adding, however, "I intend hereafter, with the help of God, to put it forth in his old English (the English of Wycliffe's period) which shall well serve, I doubt not, both for the northern and the faithful brethren in Scotland.¹" Don Petro de Puebla, Spanish ambassador at Holyrood, in the reign of James IV, says, in a dispatch, his (the king's) "Scottish language differs from English as Arragonese from Castilian."

¹ Two Scottish bards of the period bar, calls him "Lamp Lollardorum," quarrelled, and one of them, a and also "Judas, Jow, Juglour, younger son of Lord Kennedy, in Lollard Lawreat." Dunbar's Poems, his "Flyting" with the poet Dun- vol. II, p. 85, &c.

The lines quoted near the top of p. 94 are from Wright's "Political Songs, from Edward II to Henry VI," p. 244. The Lives and Acts of Tyler, Ball, and Oldcastle are illustrated with some fulness in Maurice's "English Popular Leaders of the Middle Ages," vol. II, London, 1875.

TYNDALE.

The altitude of some tall crag
That is the eagle's birthplace, or some peak
Familiar with forgotten years, that shows
Gnarled, as with the silence of the thought,
Upon its bleak and visionary sides,
The history of many a winter storm,
Or obscure record of the path of fire.

There the sun himself,
At the calm close of summer's longest day,
Rests his substantial orb ; between these heights,
And on the top of either pinnacle,
More keenly than elsewhere in night's blue vault,
Sparkle the stars, as of their station proud.

CHAPTER V.

THE only Bible of the English people had been for a century and upwards the written translation of Wycliffe and Purvey. The Lollards, as a distinct party in the realm, had fallen from a conspicuous position, but "the word of the Lord endureth for ever," and in many homes their Book must have been a light, and in many hearts the hidden spring of comfort and power. The Wycliffe Bible was, however, only a version from a version, yet, as Latin was the language of the church, a translation from the Vulgate was made from a recognized source, and the correctness of any rendering could, therefore, be easily ascertained. And why should not a plain rustic or a tradesman have his English Bible, and be put into the same position as a gentleman of education who can read and understand the Latin one? Any attempt to translate from a Greek original at that period, had it been practicable, might have led to confusion and misunderstanding; for ignorance would have branded such a book as heretical and misleading, if it was found to differ in any way from the ecclesiastical text. The common people could not have appreciated these variations, and such prejudices would have been created against the new version as the priesthood could easily foster and spread. Yet the translation of the Latin Scriptures had been a first step to something higher, an intermediate gift to the nation. The effect had been like the first touch of the Blessed Hand upon its vision—"it saw men as trees walking;" and when at length the second touch passed over it, it looked up, and then it "saw every man clearly."

As early as the seventh century some knowledge of Greek

must have been diffused in the island, through the influence of Archbishop Theodore of Tarsus,¹ who brought with him some Greek manuscripts; and such scholarship might be feebly preserved for a period in a few monastic establishments. Petrarch had received a slight initiation into Greek from Barlaam, but he could not read Homer without a Latin gloss, and Boccaccio supplied him with such a guide in 1361. Both Alcuin and Bede understood Greek; and it was taught from about the year 1395 by Emmanuel Chrysoloras, in Venice, Milan, Florence, and Genoa. Alexander V, chosen Pope in 1409, and a Greek by birth, patronized the revived study of his mother tongue. A few scholars had some acquaintance with it, such as Roger Bacon, John of Basingstoke, Archdeacon of Leicester, and Grosseteste, one of the most illustrious men of his age, who influenced English thought and literature in a remarkable degree, and advocated translations of Scripture, though he set his seal to two worthless spurious productions, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the works of Dionysius the Areopagite. Another eminent scholar, Richard Aungerville or De Bury tutor to Edward III, then Bishop of Durham and for a few months Chancellor of England, has left us his *Philobiblon*, a species of autobiography, in which, while showing the many means eagerly employed by him to add to his library, he deplores the common ignorance of Greek, and intimates that he had taken care that all "our scholars should possess" a Greek as well as a Hebrew grammar. But Greek was really unknown for a century afterwards, or until the period of what is commonly called the revival of letters; the nearer causes of that resuscitation being the fall of Constantinople in 1453, and the flight of learned Greeks into Europe, when five boats laden with them and their literary treasures crossed over to Italy. Among those exiles, Argyropylus and Chalcondyles, Andronicus Callistus and Constantine Lascaris occupy an honoured place. The early disputes excited by the renewed study of Plato, under the influence of Ficini and others, indicate the spreading love and acquirement of Greek. Greek chairs were founded in the universities, and filled by enthusi-

¹ See page 4.

astic teachers. In 1472, George Hermonymus, a Spartan, settled in Paris, and became the Greek teacher of Budæus and Reuchlin; and Gregory Typhernas also taught in the same city. Vitellius, an Italian, taught Greek at Oxford, having Grocyn as one of his pupils. Croke followed Erasmus, in 1522, as Greek professor at Cambridge. Calphurnius was first Greek teacher in Wolsey's new college, his successor being Lupset, who had been tutor to the cardinal's son commonly known by the name of Dr. Wynter.¹

Grocyn, a Wykamist, eulogized by Erasmus as his "patron and preceptor," and in whom he admired a "universal compass" of learning, had, in 1491, begun to teach Greek at Oxford, after having been for some time in Italy. Colet, on returning from Italy to the same university in 1496, commenced a series of lectures on St. Paul's Epistles, though he had not yet taken deacon's orders. He was the sole survivor of a family of twenty-one brothers and sisters, and heir to a fortune left by his father, who had been Lord Mayor of London, and he yet lives in his noble foundation of St. Paul's School.² When Dean of St. Paul's, he was suspected of being a reformer, and persecuted by his diocesan, Bishop Fitzjames, who had been chaplain to Edward IV, and Lord High Almoner to Henry VII. Tyndale mentions it as a well-known fact, that Fitzjames would have made Dean Colet a heretic for translating the paternoster into English, had

¹ Tanner, Bale, and Leland give us Charles V bought one hundred incidental notices of a few Greek Greek books, and that Francis I scholars, as Adam Eston, a Bene- hired a Greek secretary, while dictine of Norwich, who died at Matthias Corvinus purchased an Rome, 1397; John Bates, a Carmel- immense quantity of MSS. from ite of York, 1429; Flemmyng, Greek fugitives, his librarian at Dean of Lincoln, 1450; William Buda being Bartholomew Frontinus, Gray, Bishop of Ely, 1454; John who had been a professor of Greek Phrea, of Bristol (died 1464); Wil- at Florence.

² Two of Colet's works, the Hier- archies of Dionysius, and Lectures on Romans, have been recently published, appropriately edited by T. H. Lupton, M.A., Surmaster of St. Paul's School, London, 1869. It may be added that, in 1472, 1873.

not Archbishop Warham shielded him. Linacre had enjoyed, along with the children of Lorenzo del' Medici, the instruction of Politian and Chalcondyles, and having taken the degree of M.D. at Padua, he became court physician to Henry VIII, and in 1518 he founded the Royal College of Physicians, being also its first president. Erasmus eulogizes his acuteness, depth, and accuracy. Lilly, whom More calls "his most dear companion," was another of the revivers of Greek learning. He had studied five years at Rhodes, and was the first to teach Greek in the metropolis. He was chosen the first Master of Colet's School of St. Paul's, and his Grammar, published in 1513, has dictated Latin formulæ to many successive generations. William Latimer, Fellow of All Souls, in 1489 went and studied at Padua, and on his return taught Greek at Oxford. He was appointed tutor to Reginald Pole, to whom he owed his preferments in the church. Erasmus describes him as a "true divine, and noted for his integrity." Thomas More, afterwards the famous chancellor, belonged to the same eager band. In 1498, Erasmus came to Oxford with a recommendation to Father Charnock from the Prior and Canons of St. Geneviève, in Paris, and was at once welcomed into the College of St. Mary the Virgin. The thin, pale stranger did not know a word of English; but the object of his toil and travail was to obtain or perfect a knowledge of Greek.

Greek literature was thus studied with special keenness and assiduity, and the Scriptures began to be examined without regard to dry and worn-out forms. Cambridge was not behind Oxford; and the witty, vagrant, and laborious Erasmus, on a subsequent visit to England, held for some few years its chair of Greek, and, through the influence of Fisher, Chancellor of the University, was appointed Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity. The kindness of his patron Archbishop Warham Erasmus heartily repaid by a dedication to him of the Works of St. Jerome, and a long and elaborate eulogy in a note to 1 Thess. i, 7. This intense enthusiasm for the study of the old tongue of Hellas, created and exemplified by those early and devoted scholars, made it possible that the next translation of the New Testament should be from the original Greek; and

there was one ardent soul among them, but unrecognized by them, that was quietly and unconsciously disciplining itself for such a momentous enterprise.

Almost contemporaneous with the introduction of Greek learning, was the invention of printing, a mechanical craft, born to minister to intellectual power, at a time when its assistance was specially needed. For the European mind was waking up from the sleep of ages, and new ideas eager for dissemination could not wait the slow, expensive, and uncertain quill of the "brief-men."¹ The press, with its speed of impression and power of multiplication, fitted into the epoch, and gave to thought not only a permanent form, but immediate and wide diffusion. An author became a living centre to an immense circle of readers, and his words flew among them with rapidity and ease. The manufacture of vulgar material into paper had been no less astonishing; and a rag trodden in the wintry mire of the streets might be so transformed as to bear upon it a divine message, or become a portion of that Book "the leaves of which are for the healing of the nations."

Gutenberg,² or Gensfleisch, had made some experiments in printing with movable metallic types prior to 1439; after some delay and loss of money, Fust, a goldsmith of Mentz, was taken into his confidence, and, by his own genius and his partner's financial help, the Latin Bible was printed towards the close of 1455, in two folios of 1282 pages.³ The world

¹ The wages of a copyist may be learned from one of the Paston Letters, W. Ebesham sends in his bill in 1468: "twopence a leaf" for prose, or in our money about two shillings, and a "penny a leaf," or one shilling, for verses of thirty lines in a page; ornamented letters, or "rub-rishing" in colour, being charged in addition. But the scribes were not always well rewarded. Bentley gave Wetstein only £50 for collating a manuscript of some size, and Wetstein tells that it took him two hours to read one page. Bentley's Correspondence, p. 501, London, 1842.

² He took his mother's name, his father's being Gensfleisch; and the inscription on Thorwaldsen's statue of him in Mentz names him Gensfleisch de Gutenberg.

³ Called often the Mazarin Bible, a copy being discovered by De Bure in the Cardinal's library. A copy on vellum, sold in 1827, brought only £504; another, sold at the sale of the Perkins library in 1874, realized £3,400.

was all the while wholly ignorant of the strange occupation which had lodged itself in the midst of it. The swift and continuous issue of uniform copies, and the eagerness to sell for sixty crowns what the penmen would have charged four hundred for, led to accusations of magic, and suspicions of confederacy with the powers of evil. The first printers were willing to foster the impression that their pages were still inscribed by hand; but honest Caxton revealed the truth in the preface to his first publication. "It is not written with pen and ink as other books, but empyrnted." A second edition of the Bible, by Fust and Schœffer, appeared in 1462, and there had been two editions of a Psalter in 1457 and in 1459. When one looks at the form of the letters,¹ "the strength of the paper, and the lustre of the ink" in these earliest volumes, he is inclined to conclude that printing has for the last four centuries made little improvement, save in quickness and cheapness, and that the art was perfect at its birth, like Athene springing at once in full armour from the brain of Zeus. The sack of Mentz in 1462 scattered the skilled workmen, so that the new power soon leapt out of its secrecy, was welcomed in Italy, and established in Rome by Sweynheym and Pannartz, under Pope Paul II. The press at Rome sent out in a few years more than twelve thousand volumes in twenty-eight editions. The art was carried to Paris in 1469; but not to Scotland till 1507. About 1474, Caxton, who had learned the mystery abroad, set up a press at Westminster, and he had some noted successors, Wynkyn de Worde, Pynson, and Rastell. Through Holland, Germany, and France, the recent invention at once proved a power betokening yet mightier results. Another era had dawned, and in the revival of letters, and in the employment of the press, due preparation was made for setting forth the Bible in its own tongues and in translations, and for putting such texts and versions into immediate dispersion over all lands.

¹ The common form of letter so employed in the Roman capital, familiar to us, is called the Roman Italic letters being first used in character, from a fount of types Venice.

CHAPTER VI.

AMONG the youths attracted to Cambridge, probably by the fame of Erasmus, there was one who had been for some years at Oxford, a busy learner, whose studies and attainments in Greek were soon to be directed through life and death to the noblest of works—William Tyndale. Though William Tyndale has reared for himself an imperishable monument in our English Bible, the place and date of his birth are alike uncertain. On such points he is himself very reticent in his writings, perhaps from the fear of bringing others into suspicion and trouble. It has been for a century and a half the opinion of biographers that he was born at Hunt's Court, North Nibley, in the hundred of Berkeley, Gloucestershire; and in honour of that belief a handsome column has been erected to his memory on Nibley Knoll, a beautiful eminence in the Cotswold Range. But it is now believed that, though the Tyndales of Hunt's Court¹ might be relations of the martyr, they were not in possession of that property till after his death. Thomas Tyndale and Alice Hunt, of Hunt's Court, had a son named William, and Christopher Anderson and others have fixed on him as the Translator; but this William was alive in 1542, while the other was put to death at Vilvorde in 1536. Mr. Demaus² has lately discovered in the State Paper Office a letter from Stokesley, Bishop of London to Thomas Crumwell, which throws some light on the

¹ There had also been Tyndales or river lands which formed part of who were farmers at Milksham the manor of Hurst.

Court, in the adjoining parish of Stinchcombe, and there was a Richard Tyndale, who held some reclaimed
² "William Tyndale, a biography," quite a model in brevity, clearness, and research.

question. The purport of the bishop's epistle is to ask a grant of a farm to one of his servants, and in pressing his suit he characterizes a rival suppliant in these significant words—"He that sueth unto you hath a kinsman called Edward Tyndale (brother to Tyndale the arch-heretic), and under-receiver of the lordship of Berkeley, which may and daily doth promote his kinsfolk to the king's farms." The Marquis of Berkeley, who died in 1492, left his estates to Henry VII, and Edward Tyndale collected the royal rents, having been nominated to the office by letters patent in 1519. The "Receiver"¹ got also a grant of the lease of the manor of Slymbridge in 1529, and this was probably at an earlier time the scene of both his own and his brother's birth, for the family had held some portions of it from the reign of Richard III. These statements, however, are in conflict with the pedigrees concocted for the translator; but Stokesley, who had himself been rector of Slymbridge in 1509, could scarcely be in error, and his precise assertion must be in the meantime regarded as conclusive evidence on the point. Foxe is therefore to be credited, when, because he had not or could not get more definite information, he notes, "Touching the birth and parentage of that blessed martyr of Christ, he was born on the borders of Wales." The surname would indicate that the family originally came from the north of England. There were Lords of Tyndale at an early period; and Adam de Tyndale held a barony under King John. Some of the branches are supposed to have dropped their name from being involved in the Wars of the Roses, and to have adopted the more plebeian appellation of Hitchens, Hutchens, or Hochens. On the title-page of his first avowed publication, the name is "William Tyndale, otherwise called Hichens." The name Hitchin occurs in Domesday Book, County of Hertford. But this story about the reason of change of the name is said not to be older than the period of Charles II. According to the genealogy given at some length by Anderson and Offor,² there had been a Baron de Tyndale of Langley Hall, and from the

¹ Annals of the English Bible, vol. I, p. 16, &c. London, William Pickering, 1845. ² Life prefixed to his reprint of the New Testament, London, 1836.

second son of the last baron several families, including that of the translator, had sprung. But many points in this genealogy are not at all satisfactory, or beyond dispute. Offor is not to be implicitly followed, and Anderson's hero-worship lulled him into credulity. Both of them relied on some statements made by Oade Roberts, who was collaterally descended from the Tyndales of Hunt's Court.¹

As Tyndale was some years younger than Sir Thomas More, who, according to the best account, was born in 1478 (the year then running to Lady day, March 25th), his birth may be placed in 1484 or 1485, a century after Wycliffe's death. He was sent to college at an early age, "brought up from a child in the University of Oxford." According to Wood, he was "trained in grammar, logic, and philosophy in the Mary Magdalene's Hall," founded by Bishop Waynflete in 1448, and commonly called "Grammar Hall," from the prominence given in it to classical learning, under the tuition of Grocyn, Latimer, and Linacre. His course was of some length—"by long continuance he grew up and increased in the knowledge of tongues and other liberal arts."

But the Bible had already attracted his love and labour. His proficiency was seen not only in common and secular studies, but "specially in knowledge of the Scriptures, whereunto his mind was singularly addicted, insomuch that he read privily to certain students and fellows of Magdalene College² some parcel of divinity, instructing them in the knowledge and truth of the Scriptures." His character was in harmony with his pursuits, "his manners and conversation were such that all who knew him respected and esteemed him to be a man of most virtuous disposition and life unspotted." According to Foxe, "he proceeded in degrees of the schools at Oxford"; but Wood writes, "whether he took a degree doth not appear in our registers." The retort of Sir Thomas More is usually supposed to imply that Tyndale had graduated. In showing that

¹ British Museum, Additional MSS., 9,458. tory of the College. Magdalene Hall was a sort of preparatory school

² A portrait of Tyndale, with a Latin inscription, hangs in the Refec- in connection with the larger foundation of Magdalene College.

"grace" has various meanings, Tyndale adds in illustration, "In universities many ungracious graces there be gotten"; and More answers with a bitter sneer, "He should have made it more plain and better perceived, if he had said, as for example, where his own grace was there granted to be Master of Arts." But such an invective is not positive testimony. There is no ground, however, for supposing that he was expelled from the University on account of holding any novel doctrines; though perhaps he may have incurred some suspicion, as Colet had done by his unscholastic lectures, for Foxe relates, "increasing more and more in learning, and spying his time, he removed thence to the University of Cambridge, whence he made his abode for a certain space," being now "further ripened in the knowledge of God's Word." Erasmus was at Cambridge from 1509 to 1514, and Tyndale may have resolved to study under the most famed scholar of the age.

No record of Tyndale's ordination has been preserved. There is, however, a legend that he was ordained priest to the Nunnery of Lambley on the western border of Northumberland; but according to Warham's register, this Tyndale, who was ordained in St. Bartholomew, Smithfield, on the 11th March, 1502-3, belonged to the diocese of Carlisle; and in that year William Tyndale had not reached the requisite age for orders. Another fiction about him is that, in 1508, he entered as a friar into the Monastery of the Observants at Greenwich. On the title-page of a small folio book named "*Sermones de Herolt*" (1495), in the library of the Cathedral of St. Paul's, the Rev. R. H. Barham found the inscription, "Charitably pray for the soul of John Tyndale, who gave this book to the Monastery of Greenwich on the day that brother William his son made his profession, in the year 1508." But the inscription does not help to any identification, and Tyndale's own words, sometimes adduced as collateral proof of the statement, have been misunderstood. In the preface to the "*Wicked Mammon*," he relates that one William Roye had been with him, and that a year after his departure came over "Jerome, a brother of Greenwich also"—"also," that is, as well as Roye. The two men both belonged to the reformed order of Franciscan friars,

and the adverb "also"¹ is in no way intended to include Tyndale himself, as indeed the context plainly determines. Besides, to lay aside the cowl was a misdemeanour never to be forgotten or forgiven, but not one of Tyndale's adversaries ever taunts him with such unpardonable violation of his vows. While More calls Luther, Ecolampadius, Roye, and Jerome either friars or apostates, he names him simply Tyndale, or Sir William, or Hitchins. Ridley also, in writing in 1527 to Archbishop Warham's chaplain, speaks with discrimination of Mr. W. Tyndale and Friar William Roye; and in a list of names written on the last leaf of a copy of the Pope's Bull of 1520 against Luther, inserted in Tunstall's Register of 1530, there occur, "Willimus Tyndall; Willimus Roy, apostata; Ricus Brightwell (Fryth)"; the odious epithet being given only to the perjured friar. The story, therefore, that Tyndale had been a monk, which is found in Offor,² and repeated from him by Blunt,³ Dabney,⁴ and the author of the "*Introduction to Bagster's English Hexapla*," is completely disproved.

On leaving Cambridge, Tyndale resorted to one Master Walsh, a knight of Gloucestershire, "and was there school-master to his children." We can only conjecture why, probably in 1521, Tyndale left Cambridge, and why, in his prime, he became tutor in a rural mansion to children so very young, the eldest of them, born in 1516, being only six years of age. Perhaps he had met with some disappointment, or his convictions, based on the teachings of Scripture, had prevented him from seeking preferment in the church, or aspiring to any position of honour and usefulness in his university. Writing in 1531, he refers to certain ecclesiastical omens which he had been marking "above this dozen years"; his observations had,

¹ The most of the brief phrases within inverted commas found in these pages are from Foxe, v, 114, &c.; and it may be added that his first edition, consisting so much of original documents in the words of contemporaries, is greatly fresher and more graphic than the subsequent issues.

² Life, p 8.

³ A plain account of the English Bible, p. 31, London, 1870. The "Account" is a reprint of the tenth chapter of his "*Reformation of the Church of England*."

⁴ Preface to Tyndale's New Testament, Andover and New York, 1837.

therefore, commenced during his academic residence. Sir John Walsh, who had been knighted as the king's champion at the coronation of Henry VIII, lived at Little Sodbury Manor, a few miles from Tyndale's birthplace. "He kept a good ordinarie commonly at his table," and Tyndale met there many ecclesiastics of the West of England, "abbots, deans, archdeacons, with divers other doctors, and great beneficed men." When his conversation with these guests incidentally grew into disputes, his standard of appeal was the "Book," with which he was well acquainted, and which had been, in fact, the study of his life. Sir John and his lady who was "stout and wise," were tempted to tell him on one occasion that, since so many divines with wealthy livings did not hold his views, it was surely not to be expected that he, so poor and dependent, was to be listened to with implicit credence. His reply to such an argument—which weighed learning by social position and emolument—was his translation of the *Enchiridion Militis Christiani* of Erasmus,¹ a treatise which gave him new favour in the eyes of his patrons who were greatly edified by it. This handbook, or "pocket dagger of the Christian soldier," written in 1501, teaches that Christianity does not consist in the reception of scholastic dogmas, or in the observance of ceremonies, but in yielding suit and service to the Saviour-king, and in carrying on continuous warfare against all that is evil in one's own heart, or in the world around him.² His own earlier ecclesiastical beliefs had certainly been shaken, though none of Luther's books could at this time have come into his hands. In these free and unguarded discussions referred to, he was creating a character for himself; and prejudices against him soon ripened into open hostility. According to Fuller, the dignified clergy at length preferred to forbear Master Walsh's good cheer, rather than have his "sour sauce therewith." "Unlearned priests," as Tyndale himself calls them, "being rude and ignorant, and having seen no more of Latin than that

¹ It was published in an abridged form by Coverdale, and is included in the Parker Society edition of his Works, p. 489. An account of it will be found in Drummond's *Erasmus*, vol. I, p. 113, London, 1873. ² Erasmus explains *Enchiridion* by *pugionculus*.

only they read in their portesses and missales," flocked together to the ale house, "which is their preaching place," and there raged and railed at him. Such accusations were soon carried to the spiritual authorities. Giulio del' Medici, the Bishop of Worcester, afterwards Pope Clement VII, dwelt in his own sunny land, and when Tyndale appeared, in answer to his summons before Dr. Parker, the diocesan chancellor, he was "reviled and rated as though he had been a dog."¹ Sir Thomas More afterward says of him, "that before he went abroad he savoured so shrewdly that he was once or twice examined of heresy."²

The tutor was in this way stigmatized by enemies who, making up in vituperation what they wanted in argument, called him "a heretic in sophistry, a heretic in logic, and a heretic in divinity." All this persecution on the part of men without scholarship or literary culture must have fretted him, while it showed him his true mission, and gradually tended to crystallize his floating ideas into the great and firm purpose of his life—the translation of Scripture. In a brief autobiography contained in his preface to the "Five Books of Moses," Tyndale throws the impulse and resolve to be a translator back to this epoch. He observed that "the sense of the divine Word was obscured by expositions clean contrary unto the process, order, and meaning of the text— which thing only

¹ The vehemence of Parker got him some years afterwards into expensive trouble. William Tracy, Esquire of Toddington, Gloucestershire, had, in his will of date October, 1530, left on purpose no money for masses or prayers "to help" his soul, as he trusted in the merits of the one Mediator, Jesus Christ. The Convocation of 1531, alarmed at the circulation of this testamentary deed, declared him excommunicated, and this sentence, according to *Decret. Greg. lib. i, tit. xxxviii, c. 12*, entailed the dis-

grace of exhumation. Parker dug up and burned the heretic's bones, without waiting for a writ required by the statute de Heretico Comburendo. For this illegal proceeding against his father's dead body, Richard Tracy at once sued Chancellor Parker, who was fined £300, or about £4,500 at present value. Tyndale's tract on Tracy's Testament will be found in his Works, vol. III, p. 271, Parker Society edition.

² Dialogue, book iv, chap. 17. Works, p. 283, London, 1557.

moved me to translate the New Testament. Because I had perceived by experience how that it was impossible to establish the lay-people in any truth, except the Scripture were plainly laid before their eyes in their mother tongue, that they might see the process, order, and meaning of the text."¹ That this chief end was now steadily in his view is disclosed by his own words. In a controversy with a "certain divine recounted for a learned man," who in a burst of indignation had retorted, "It were better to be without God's law than the Pope's," Tyndale replied, "I defy the Pope and all his laws," and avowed that, "if God spared his life, ere many years he would cause a boy that driveth the plough to know more of the Scriptures than the Pope did." And he kept his word, his translation being so terse and simple that all who could read it might understand it. Some, commenting on this utterance, style Tyndale "a young dreamer." But he was no youth, for he was in "the mid-time of his days," and the dream was a waking one—one of those visions that grow "realities to earnest men"; and are like those of Joseph, that so soon translated themselves into fact. He may have made some experiments—some tentative translations—about this time, and he longed now for some peaceful retreat to begin and carry on his self-imposed task. Such was his simplicity of soul that, in reply to various invectives against his boldness, ambition, and love of notoriety, he quietly answered on one occasion, "He was contented that they should bring him into any county in all England, giving him ten pounds to live with, and binding him to no more but to teach children, and to preach."² Being so "turmoiled in the country," he was at length obliged to leave the family of Sir John Walsh, who, he foresaw, would not be able "to keep him out of the hands of the spirituality," and he came for refuge to the metropolis in the end of the summer, or in the autumn, of 1523.

After preaching for some time at St. Dunstan's in the West,

¹ Works, vol. I, p. 393. Parker various parts, as at Bristol, "in the Society edition. common place called St. Austin's

² It may be noted that Tyndale Green." often preached at this time in

he asked for admission into the household of Cuthbert Tunstall, who had become Bishop of London in 1522, of whose learning and love of learned men he had heard, and whom Erasmus "praiseth exceedingly." The praise referred to belongs, however, to a subsequent period. Tunstall is mentioned in the preface to the fourth edition of the New Testament, but not with exceeding praise. As his recommendation to his Lordship, he sent him an English version of an oration of Isocrates.¹ The specimen was presented through Sir Harry Guildford, the royal comptroller, and a commendatory letter was also transmitted through "one William Hebilthwayte, a man of mine old acquaintance." "If I might," he wrote some years afterwards, "come into the Bishop of London's service, thought I, I were happy." But he was disappointed, the answer of the bishop being that his house was full, and the applicant was advised, if not encouraged, to seek what he wanted somewhere else in London. Tyndale was, according to his own account of himself, "evil-favoured in this world, and without grace in the sight of men, speechless and rude, dull and slow-witted";² and probably, from his awkward rusticity, he made no impression on my Lord of London, whom his disappointed visitor portrays as a "still Saturn that seldom speaketh, but walketh up and down all day musing, a ducking hypocrite, made to dissemble." These acid words indicate that the bishop had received him with cold politeness, listened to him in silence, and dismissed him with scant courtesy. Tunstall's haughty taciturnity probably so froze him that he did not venture to hint at his project of translating the New Testament. Had he intimated such a purpose, the bishop would have given him an answer which he must have put on record. His own conclusion is, "God saw that I was beguiled, and that counsel was not the nearest way to my purpose; and therefore he gave me no favour in my Lord's sight." No new patron turned up to

¹ A handsome edition of Isocrates edition was published by Aldus at had been published at Milan in Venice in 1513. Neither of these 1493, bearing witness to the editorial taste and scholarship of Latin translation. Demetrius Chalcondyles. Another ² Letter to Fryth in 1532 or 1533.

forward his views, but Humphrey Munmouth, merchant, showed him no little kindness, having been attracted to him by the style and earnestness of his sermons, and he then took up his abode with this "Gaius," his host. As Munmouth dealt in cloths, he had commercial transactions with the manufacturers of Gloucestershire, among whom would in all likelihood, be some of Tyndale's relations. Munmouth was the benefactor of many other reformers, such as Fryth; and it is most probable that at this time Tyndale made the acquaintance of one so "like minded," who became so dear to him, and preceded him in martyrdom. For Fryth had not come to Cambridge before Tyndale left it, and he was arrested with others at Oxford in 1528.

A year's residence in London taught Tyndale many painful lessons, and he traced the divine hand and purpose in his disappointments. The pomp and power of ecclesiastical dignitaries, their blindness and their security, their disregard of evangelical truth and their malignant opposition to the circulation of the Scriptures even in Greek; their dread of change, and their stern suspicions of all who might ripen into reformers, saddened him and brought him to "understand at the last, not only that there was no room in my Lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament; but also, that there was no place to do it in all England, as experience doth now (1530) openly declare." He must have observed many indications of a darkening period of conflict. Fox, Bishop of Winchester, had, in 1516, instituted Corpus Christi College at Oxford, and given it teachers both of Latin and Greek. Wolsey, "a scholar, and a ripe and good one," had also, in 1519, founded a Greek professorship at Oxford, and another of Rhetoric and Latin. The occupants of these chairs were violently assailed; but the king interposed and ordered that "the study of the Scriptures in the original languages," should not only be permitted for the future, but received as a regular branch of academical study. Such incidents showed an incipient appreciation of the study of the original Scriptures, and it was not too profound a vaticination to foresee that the next step after the possession and study of the Greek New Testament, must

naturally be the translation of it as a national necessity. Tyndale had likewise seen the effects of the Greek New Testament at Cambridge, its saving power on some, and its hardening effect on others; indeed, one of the colleges had forbidden the entrance of the book within its walls, "by horse or by boat, by wheels or on foot," and Erasmus himself had been openly opposed by Lee and by Standish.¹ Tyndale could forecast, from such commotions, what the result would be at no distant date, and could divine that the authorities in the church would rise from warning to formal inhibition, and from it to persecution and capital punishment.

The path which Providence had marked out for Tyndale was not one of bustle, remonstrance, or agitation. His work needed quiet and leisure, prolonged and undisturbed study. His manner of life in London was honestly told a few years later by Munmouth, in self-defence before the Privy Council, in May, 1528. He was formally accused of giving money to Tyndale when he was abroad, of contributing pecuniary help to the translation of the New Testament, and of having his version and some heretical books in his possession. His house had been searched, and himself examined and sent to the Tower on the 14th of May. Four days after his imprisonment, the "poor prisoner" sent a memorial to Wolsey and the Council praying for liberation. This memorial describes in simple terms the manner of Tyndale's life, while he stayed with this kind protector. "I took him into my house half a year; and there he lived as a good priest, as methought. He studied most part of the day and of the night at his book; and he would eat but sodden meat, by his goodwill; and drink but single small beer. I never saw him wear linen about him, in the time he was with

¹ See, on the *Novum Instrumentum* of Erasmus, Seebohm's *Oxford Reformers* of 1498, London, 1867, p. 365. Lee asserted that he had discovered 300 errors in it, and Standish was horrified beyond measure at the substitution of *sermo* for *verbum* in John i. 1. Both men adored the Vulgate, and many of their contemporaries believed in the inspiration of Jerome. Stunica was patriotically indignant that Erasmus had dared to spell his native country *Eravia* in Rom. xv, 28, not *Ieravia*, robbing the haughty kingdom of a letter.

me. I did promise him ten pounds sterling to pray for my father and mother, their souls, and all Christian souls. I did pay it him when he made his exchange to Hamborough. Afterward he got of some other men, ten pounds sterling more, the which he left with me. And within a year after, he sent for his ten pounds to me from Hamborough, and thither I sent it him by one Hans Collenbeke. And since I have never sent him the value of one penny, nor never will. I have given more exhibitions¹ to scholars in my days than to that priest. The foresaid sir William left me an English book, called *Enchiridion*.² Also, I had a little treatise that the priest sent me, when he sent for his money. When I heard my lord of London preach at St. Paul's Cross, that sir William Tyndale had translated the New Testament into English, and was naughtily translated, that was the first time that ever I suspected or knew any evil of him."

Ten pounds was then probably equal in value to £150 of present currency. An acre of land was at this period about eightpence in annual value, and the average price of wheat was six and eightpence a quarter, while beef or pork was a halfpenny, and mutton three farthings a pound. In 1525, a pair of hose cost two and fourpence, and a pair of shoes one and fourpence. Latimer's father had a farm of three or four pounds by the year. A penny a day as a labourer's wages, therefore, represents considerably more than a shilling at the present time.³ By Act of Parliament under Henry V, "the wages of a parish priest had been fixed at £5, 6s. 8d. a year, and the statute remained in force in the reign of Henry VIII. Bradford the martyr writes in 1549, "My fellowship here (Pembroke Hall) is worth seven pounds a year. . . . Thus you see what a good Lord God is to me."⁴ The salary of Udal, as head-master of Eton, was ten pounds a year; and ten pounds a year was all that Tyndale himself asked for support in teaching and preaching.

It need not create surprise that in the declaration of Munmouth the poor scholar is usually called Sir William.

¹ Small pensions or stipends.

² See p. 112.

³ Froude's History, vol i, p. 21, &c.

⁴ Works, p. xviii, Parker Society.

"Sir," representing the Latin *Dominus*, does not seem to have been given, at least originally, to all priests. It was not an academic title, but was conferred at first on persons in orders who had taken a Bachelor's degree. Those who had proceeded to M.A. were called Master, Magister.¹ "Sir" is often the title given to domestic chaplains, probably because many of this class, from poverty or other causes, had left the university without taking the Master's degree. As a complimentary title it may have been given at length on a wider scale; but Masters and Doctors would repudiate it, as they had the right to a more distinctive appellation.² The familiar appellation of Sir William would, therefore, seem to imply that Tyndale had not become Master of Arts.

¹ There are lists of Scottish clergy, Master Garret; with Master Clark: as in Knox's History and other old documents, in which occurs the title "Sir," along with Magister, Frater, and Doctor. Knox himself is called Sir John Knox, as he had not a Master's degree. In Bishop Longland's letter to Wolsey about the spread of heresy at Oxford and the introduction into the University of Tyndale's translation, there is this list given of ringleaders, "with Master Garret; with Master Clark: Sir Fryth, Sir Dyot and Anthony Dalaber, of Albans Hall, the last being a secular scholar. Fryth had taken B.A. at Cambridge, prior to his translation to Oxford, but Garret, curate to the rector of Honey Lane, London, wore his Master's hood when he carried his faggot from St. Mary's to Cardinal College.

² See p. 109.

CHAPTER VII.

WHAT Tyndale could not enjoy in England his eager spirit hoped to find abroad. He left London, probably in May, 1524, certainly not in January, as Anderson thinks, for at that season the navigation of the Elbe is impeded by the ice. His expatriation was forced upon him; residence at home was incompatible with the duty which he had laid upon himself. Some seven years after, in 1531, he appealed to Vaughan, a candid correspondent of Crumwell and King Henry, in feeling words, which the envoy repeated to His Majesty: "If for my pains therein taken; if for my poverty; if for mine exile from my native land, and bitter absence from my friends; if for my hunger, my thirst, and my cold, and the danger with which I am everywhere compassed, and finally, if for innumerable other hard and sharp fightings which I endure."¹ . . . He did not become a Stoic, soured at his country and longing for revenge. He was no fanatic ever weaving plots and combinations to secure his return; no splenetic fugitive bewailing his fate in bitterness of soul, or venting his wrath in puny diatribes or malignant satires. He felt all the privations of an exile from a land "loved and longed for;" but, having counted the cost, and made his choice, he patiently and heroically suffered scorn, poverty, sudden flights, with other nameless evils, that he might finish his work. If the faces of kindred and friends sometimes haunted him, and the voice of a mother or sister fell like a soft and distant echo on his ear, if at such a weary moment he was tempted to look back, his hand never left the plough which always traced a deep and straight furrow.

Cotton MSS., Titus, B. i.

Tyndale took up his residence in Hamburg, a solitary and unknown foreigner, and set about his great undertaking. It is impossible to say whether he had made much progress in it previously to his departure, but the months of study, "most part of the day and of the night," at his book, which he spent under Munmouth's roof were very probably devoted to translation, for he had come to London burning with strong desire to do this "one thing." He was not allowed to do it in the bishop's palace, as he had so fondly anticipated, but he must have begun it in the house of the cloth merchant, in the parish of All Hallows, Barking. The brief time that elapsed between his arrival on the Continent and the completion of the printed New Testament, in a version so admirable and with not more marks of haste upon it, prove that he must have carried some portion of prepared material with him from England. But the fragment, containing a small section of the New Testament, which Offor refers to as having the initials W. T., and the date 1502, has been declared by Mr. Fry of Bristol to be a forgery, on evidence which Canon Westcott affirms to be "absolutely conclusive." This fragment (Luke vii, 36-50) may be found at p. 9 of Offor's *Life of Tyndale*, prefixed to his reprint of the first edition. It is a translation from the Greek; but there was at that time no printed Greek Testament, the first edition of Erasmus not being published till 1516. Besides, it is simply Tyndale's own version of 1526 very slightly altered, and yet preserving all his peculiar turns.

How long Tyndale remained at Hamburg cannot be made out. But it was an opinion early held, and often repeated, that on leaving Hamburg he went to consult Luther, and that he commenced, if he did not complete, his translation at Wittenberg. The assertion, in its first half, is supported by such names as Cochläus and Sir Thomas More, taken for granted by Foxe, repeated by Bishop Marsh,¹ by Offor, Froude,² Demaus,³ and many others. It has been as keenly denied on the other hand by not a few biographers and critics.

¹ Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible, p. 13. London, 1838.

² History, vol. III, p. 78.

³ Life of Tyndale, p. 93.

The discussion of this point ought, however, to be prefaced by one preliminary remark. It was a mistake of no common magnitude to associate the name and work of Tyndale with the name and work of Luther. The mistake, however, can be easily explained, as it was common at the time to call all men Lutherans who showed any leaning towards reformation. The great Reformer had so stamped an image of himself upon the Teutonic movement, that similar tendencies in other lands were vaguely named after him. Sir Thomas More, King Henry, Lee, and Cochläus, regarded Tyndale as a promoter of Lutheranism, and his Testament was loosely spoken of as a translation of Luther's German version. The title page of Sir Thomas More's Dialogue reads, "Touching the pestilent sect of Luther and Tyndale." But it is against all evidence to call Tyndale Lutheran¹, or to aver that his purpose was to promote Lutheranism in his own country. He was no sectarian, was never a Lutheran himself, was never allied to Luther as colleague or instrument, and nothing was farther from his thoughts than to found a sect and identify his own name with it. His "Notes" show that he had long been opposed to the papal pretension of supremacy, and to the papal errors and superstitions; but he never laboured to form or organize any protesting party. To give an English Bible to the English race from the original text was his life-labour; and he first sent it abroad without his name; for he was willing to remain an unrecognized benefactor, to be hidden "in a cleft of the rock" as the divine glory passed by and settled at length over his beloved fatherland. The English envoy, Vaughan, justifying himself to Crumwell who thought that he was favouring the Translator, avows "that he was neither Lutheran nor Tyndalian"—the only place in the mass of correspondence where the latter epithet occurs.² His own disclaimer toward the end of his life, is very touching and solemn:—

¹ Yet the epithet clung to him to be directed "*Tegen heeren* through his life, and in the bill *Willem Tindalus priestere gevangen* of expenses incurred for his ex-*Lutraiën.*"
ecution, the process by the pro-² Cotton MSS., Galba, B. x,
cureur-general of Brabant is said p. 21, &c.

"Moreover, I take God, which alone seeth the heart, to record to my conscience, beseeching Him that my part be not in the blood of Christ, if I wrote, of all that I have written, throughout all my books, ought of an evil purpose of envy or malice to any man, or to stir up any false doctrine or opinion in the Church of Christ; or to be author of any sect; or to draw disciples after me; or that I would be esteemed, or had in price above the least child that is born; save only of pity and compassion, I had, and yet have, on the blindness of my brethren, and to bring them into the knowledge of Christ; and to make every one of them, if it were possible, as perfect as an angel of heaven; and to weed out all that is not planted of our heavenly Father; and to bring down all that lifteth itself against the knowledge of the salvation that is in the blood of Christ."¹

Tyndale's work was very different from Luther's. The one was mighty by tongue and pen, for he was a man of war, of downright blows, unwearied in assault, leonine in courage, often in a rage against opponents, and dealing out to them unmeasured scorn and vituperation. The more scholarly Melancthon would have shrunk from such battles; but whatever his hand found to do, Luther did with a mighty and demonstrative earnestness. Tyndale, on the other hand, carried out his tranquil toil in his study and on the one book of divine truth which he sent forth "turned into the vulgar speech," to be "known and read of all men." If he did not enter the lists a joyous champion like Luther, he released a still mightier power when he despatched across the "silver streak of sea" the English Bible, that the people might see and read the simple, plain, and profitable Book of Truth. The visit to Wittenberg ought, therefore, to be dissociated from all imputations of Lutheranism and all tendencies toward it.

That Tyndale really travelled to Wittenberg may at the same time be argued from the following considerations. The visit is not a recent invention, or a mere conjecture of later times. All his contemporaries, friends as well as foes, affirm

¹ "Protestation" to his revised edition of the New Testament of 1534.

that he went to confer with Luther. Foxe asserts that "he took his journey into Germany and into Saxony, where he had conference with Luther and other learned men in these quarters."¹ The martyrologist delivers the statement without the least hesitation, and was suspicious of nothing in it derogatory to Tyndale's fame as a reformer, or to his originality as a translator. Cochläus, whose name will soon occur again, speaks of him and Roye as two English apostates who had been some time at Wittemberg, and who at the moment were printing the New Testament in Cologne. Cochläus was himself on the spot, and with his prying nimbleness and industry he could scarcely be mistaken. He had not, indeed, seen the volume which was then at press, and could only form a conjecture as to its nature, but that conjecture was based on the temporary sojourn of Tyndale in Luther's city.² One of the charges preferred in 1528 against Munmouth, Tyndale's benefactor, was that "with his knowledge, William Hutchin otherwise called Tyndale, and Friar Roye, or either of them, went into Almayne to Luther, there to learn his sect;" and Munmouth in his reply does not deny the accusation, or plead any ignorance of the journey to Wittemberg. Sir Thomas More affirms that Tyndale, though he "dissembled" here, yet as soon as he left England, "gat him to Luther straight"; that at the time of his translation of the New Testament, "Tyndale was with Luther at Wittemberg, and the confederacy between him and Luther was well known."³ The assertion was wrong in so far as it assumes that Tyndale translated at Wittemberg, and "set forth certain glosses on the margin, framed for the setting forth of the ungracious sect"; but to show that the assertion was no guess of his own, he adds, "as touching the confederacy between Luther and him, it is a thing well known by such as been taken and convicted here of heresy."⁴ So that the belief was current among all who had known or had heard of Tyndale's wan-

¹ Acts and Monuments, vol. IV, p. 119, London, 1838.

² De Actis et Scriptis M. Lutheri, p. 132—*Duo Angli apostatæ qui aliquamdiu fuerant Wittembergæ.*

³ Dialogue, Book III, c. 8, p. 221.

Do., Book IV, c. 17, p. 283. Works, London, 1557.

⁴ Answer to More, p. 147. Works, vol. III, Parker Society ed.

derings. More, indeed, had his own end to serve in dwelling so pointedly on the report; but if it could have been denied, or if the evidence had been contradictory, his purpose would have miscarried. Tyndale in his answer replies only to the charge of "confederacy"—"When he says Tyndale was confederate with Luther, that is not truth." He thus denies the alleged confederacy alone, and the denial, after six years' residence on the continent, would have been still more decided if he had, or could have, declared that he had never seen Luther, or had been in his company. Such a form of denial would have been very natural and conclusive if he had been warranted to adopt it. The selection of only one point in the accusation, and the curtness of the answer, would lead us to infer that Tyndale had been with Luther, though certainly he was never in concert with him. More accepted Tyndale's disavowal of the confederacy, for he drops the charge, while he still repeats the assertion that "Tyndale hath been with Luther, . . . therefore I must needs mistrust him."¹ Such was also the interpretation of Foxe, who edited the work where Tyndale's denial occurs, and yet inserts in his biography of the translator the statement which we have already quoted. Anderson, however, so misquotes Tyndale's denial as to make it decisive of the controversy. First he writes it correctly: "Tyndale was confederate with Luther—that is not truth," but he gives it an ingenious twist on the next page, thus: "Tyndale was with Luther—that is not truth," assigning to Tyndale a declaration which he never wrote, and took special care not to write. He so identified confederacy and visit, that he seems unconsciously to have made the alteration.² The rumour had also spread into France. Lee, the king's almoner (and afterwards, in succession to Wolsey, Archbishop of York), who was on a journey to Spain,

¹ Confutation, Works, p. 419.

² The writer knew Mr. Anderson somewhat in his older days, about the period of the publication of his "Annals," when he was overflowing with Tyndale. Archdeacon Cotton (Preface to Editions of the

Bible, p. x) is wrong in saying that he was "a minister at Glasgow." His residence was in Edinburgh, where he ministered ably and earnestly to a congregation of "the most straitest sect" of Baptists.

wrote from Bordeaux a letter to His Majesty on 2nd December, 1525, in which he imparts this information, "Please it your Highness to understand that I am certainly informed, as I passed in this country, that an Englishman, your subject, at the solicitation and instance of Luther, with whom he is, hath translated the New Testament into English, and within few days intendeth to arrive with the same imprinted in England."¹ The king himself also repeats the statement in his letter to his subjects, "Luther fell on device with one or two lewd persons born in this our realm, for the translating of the New Testament into English."² Dr. Robert Ridley, Bishop Tunstall's chaplain, in a letter written 24th February, to Henry Golde, Archbishop Warham's nephew and chaplain, unfolds a similar story: "As concerning this common and vulgar translation of the New Testament into English, done by Mr. William Hichyns, otherwise called Mr. William Tyndale, and Friar William Roye, manifest Lutheran hereticks and apostates, as doth openly appear by their daily company and familiarity with Luther and his disciples. . . ."³ Paul Freherus also asserts the visit to Luther, but erroneously includes Fryth in it.⁴ Finally, the supposition that Tyndale remained any long period in Hamburg is rendered less likely on the ground that this city had no printing press at the time, or for some years afterwards. Such a fact puts an end to the supposition of Anderson and others, that during his sojourn in Hamburg Tyndale "printed Matthew and Mark by themselves." Surely it is not at all probable that Tyndale would tarry for a year in a town where his fixed purpose to issue an English New Testament, could not be carried out.⁵ But the assertion of Green that Tyndale, at Luther's instance, translated at Wittemberg the Gospels and Epistles⁶ is unwarranted conjecture, wholly

¹ Cotton MSS., Vespasian, C. III., fol. 211.

² The king's letter is printed in Herbert's edition of Ames's *Typographical Antiquities*, p. 297, London, 1785.

³ Cotton MSS., Cleopat. E. V., p. 362.

⁴ In his "*Theatrum Virorum Eruditione Clarorum*," p. 109, 1688.

⁵ On this point compare "*Maitland's Reformation in England*," p. 371, &c., London, 1849.

⁶ *History of the English People*, p. 342, London, 1874.

opposed to known facts and dates. Nor did Tyndale, as he goes on to say, after Froude, "establish a press at Antwerp, where he was soon busy with his versions of the Scriptures." For there is only one version—the first edition of 1526, and the second of 1534. Nor was Tyndale even in Antwerp at the time of the visitation of Cardinal College in 1528, for he published at Marburg, in October of that year, the "*Obedience of a Christian Man*."

Arguments against the visit to Wittemberg are of no great moment. It has, for instance, been alleged that Luther's occupation at the time would have made a visit from Tyndale undesirable, if not impossible. But though Luther was hotly engaged in the fierce sacramentarian war, and was rabidly thundering against his antagonists, his jovial nature gave welcome to all strangers who might seek his presence—his heart and home were open to them. Besides, though we do not know from Tyndale himself what his opinions on the sacrament were at that period, Sir Thomas More affirms more than once that at first he did adopt views akin to those of Luther, and the affirmation was not contradicted. Nay, according to More, Tyndale converted Barnes from the "*Zuinglian heresy*"; and Luther would, on that account, have cordially congratulated the English pilgrim. Tyndale, in writing to the young martyr Fryth during his imprisonment, calmly cautions him about a point disputed so keenly—"of the presence of Christ's body in the Sacrament, meddle as little as you can."

But the great objection to any interview between Tyndale and Luther is the suspicion which it is thought to cast on his independence as a translator, and it has even been maintained against all evidence that he did not understand German. Cochlæus, indeed, mentions incidentally, that he had learned it at Wittemberg. That he knew it can admit of no doubt to any one who examines the fragment of St. Matthew, the only fragment left of his first quarto edition; for of the ninety-two glosses on the margin, more than a half are from Luther's New Testament, forty-one only being his own. He has also introduced into the prologue at least one-half of Luther's

preface, and added but four original notes. Besides, the prologue to Romans published by him in 1526 is, to a large extent, a free translation of Luther's. In reply to the indisputable assertion that Tyndale in these instances translated from the German, it has been contended that Luther's preface to Romans had already been rendered into Latin in 1523, by Justus Jonas, and that therefore Tyndale used this Latin text. But if any one will collate the German and Latin with the English version, he will find that Tyndale had both forms before him, and that while he rendered from the Latin chiefly, he took from the German what phrases struck him as being more pointed, or better suited in their fulness to his immediate purpose. It is true that, "within a year" after his departure from England, Tyndale is found in Hamburg, whence, through a merchant of the Steelyard,¹ he sent for his ten pounds, and thither Munmouth transmitted it to him. But the intervening months leave ample space for a journey to Wittenberg and a return to the seaport, where he could so readily get the money in order to begin printing at Cologne in the autumn.

Tyndale left Hamburg for Cologne probably in the summer of 1525, and was accompanied by his amanuensis, Roye, who had joined him some months before. In this city he put to press the New Testament in quarto, with marginal glosses, Peter Quentel being the printer. Quentel was connected in business with Byrckman, and the Byrckmans had bookshops both in Paris and in London. Tyndale's original intention was to print six thousand copies; but for fear of any mischance, and not from present or anticipated want of funds, he con-

¹ The Steelyard (the name still survives) was a German Guildhall (*aula Teutonicorum*), and was granted by royal letters patent in 1260. It was situated in the parish of All Hallows, near London Bridge, and was well protected by its massive walls, the "Easterling" merchants congregating there being from the Hanse towns and Rhineland, to which so large a portion of English

products was exported. The name is said to have been derived from a court or yard where steel had been sold at an earlier period. Fifteen thousand Flemings were settled in London, and were jealously watched by the ecclesiastics. Five merchants of the Steelyard, suspected of being Lollards, did penance at St. Paul's when Barnes abjured.

tented himself in the meantime with three thousand. The mischance, however, did happen, and in a way quite unlooked for. Cochläus, a keen and busy enemy of the Reformation, was at the time an exile in Cologne, and he found out and put a sudden end to Tyndale's secret enterprise. He tells his own story with a quaint and wondrous simplicity.¹ From the boast and babbling of the printers about the great change soon to take place in England, he learned something of the work which was proceeding in silent mystery. But as he could neither see nor converse with the two Englishmen, "learned in languages and fluent," and so shrewdly suspected by him, he plied some of the workmen with wine in his own lodgings, as he does not hesitate to avow, and he learned from them, over their cups, that three thousand copies of this "Lutheran New Testament," in quarto, were at press, and that ten sheets were printed, or as far as the letter K, in ordine quaternionum; that English merchants were to bear the expense, and swiftly and safely convey the books to England, before king or cardinal could be aware of the importation. Cochläus, in his alarm and amazement at a conspiracy "worse than that of the two eunuchs against Ahasuerus," consulted Herman Rinck, a patrician, then applied to the authorities who made full inquiry, and found that the information laid before them was correct, there being "great abundance of paper to complete the edition." On appeal to the senate, the printer was interdicted; but the "two English apostates," snatching away with them the quarto sheets already printed, fled by ship up the Rhine to Worms, where the

¹ Johann Dobneck, or Jodocus Cochläus (the last Latin name representing the meaning of Wendelstein, the place of his birth, near Nuremberg), has told the story three times—first in a letter to James V of Scotland, in a controversy with Alexander Ales on the question, *An expediat laicis, legere Novi Testamenti libros lingua vernacula*, vi Idus Junij—that is 10th June, 1533; and again in his *Scopa*, or reply to Sir Richard Morysyn, Leipzig, March, 1539. In his *Commentaria de Actis et Scriptis M. Lutheri*, 1549, the fullest account is given. In this book, written twenty-four years after the event, he refers distinctly to the intoxication of the printers—"postquam mero incaluisse"—p. 134.

people "were under the full rage of Lutheranism."¹ At Worms, probably in October, printing was resumed; an octavo edition, without glosses, was also put to press and finished, and the quarto edition was completed, three thousand copies of each being thrown off. A small portion of the quarto has been recovered, and it contains, with the prologue, twenty-one chapters of the Gospel of Matthew, or rather it stops with Matthew xxii, 12. This fragment, consisting of sixty-two pages or thirty-one leaves, does not contain as far as K; but if the signatures had been worked off as far as I, a considerable portion of Luke must have been printed, and Tyndale and Roye must have carried off with them to Worms twenty-seven thousand sheets. The fragment was discovered in 1836, by Mr. Rodd, an antiquarian bookseller in London, and is now in the Grenville Library, British Museum. It has been carefully photo-lithographed by Mr. Arber, and an excellent preface is prefixed.² The identification of the press was made by a collation of the form of letter and other technical minutiae, with works known to be printed by Quentel. An initial *y*, and a woodcut which, the New Testament being abruptly stopped, was afterwards pared down to fit the page of another publication, a Commentary on St. Matthew, by Rupert, a former abbot of Deutz in the twelfth century, being among the chief means of identification. The quarto was probably finished, and the octavo wholly printed, by Schœffer (son of the first printer at Mentz), who, on account of his Protestantism, had been obliged to leave his native city. A comparison of some books issued by Schœffer proves that he also printed the New Testament, as its type, size of sheet, number of lines, and watermark in the paper are the same as in the other volumes issued from his press.³ Proofs of this nature cannot be adduced for the quarto, as the only part preserved was printed at Cologne. It is strange that the place where these Testaments were printed is asserted to be Antwerp by Ames—Herbert, Panzer, Burnet, Froude, Hal-

¹ In the pithy words of Cochlaeus, "*Ubi plebs pleno furore lutherizabat.*"

² London, 1871.

³ See Mr. Fry's Introduction to his facsimile of Tyndale's New Testament, pp. 8, 9.

lam, Marsh, Russell, and Smiles; by Johnson and Newcome; while Macknight and Whittaker give the alternative of Hamburg or Antwerp, and Blunt proposes Cologne, where a small portion only of the quarto had left the press. Cochlaeus had already warned the king, Wolsey, and the Bishop of Rochester to watch all the ports, in order to prevent the introduction of "that most pernicious merchandise";¹ and Tyndale, who could not be aware of what the spy had written, but, probably suspecting that some communication would be sent to England, proceeded at once with the octavo, that it might find its way without attracting to itself special attention and suspicion. He himself seems to give the priority of printing to the octavo—"When I had translated the New Testament, and added a pistle unto the latter end,"—the reference being to this edition. In the same "Pistle or address to the Reder," at the end of the volume, he says "I beseeche that the rudeness off the worke at the fyrst tyme offende them not." The text of the quarto was apparently somewhat revised before it was reprinted in the octavo form. For though there are not many variations, perhaps not more than fifty between the two issues, the majority of the readings peculiar to the octavo are found in Tyndale's subsequent editions. The eye of the translator was vigilant; in the quarto, Matthew xx, 23, the text is "to give you"; but "you," which originated in the Vulgate, is omitted rightly in the octavo. Of the octavo only two copies survive, one perfect but without the title page, in the Baptist Theological Library, Bristol, of which Mr. Fry has published so correct and beautiful a facsimile. The other, which is imperfect, is in the Library of St. Paul's Cathedral.

It would seem that there were also separate editions of Matthew and Mark. Ridley, in a letter already quoted from, speaks of "Matthew and Mark in the first print."² The reference is not precise: as the "first print" with the "commentaries and annotation," might refer to the quarto. Foxe seems to point to an edition of Matthew by itself. On April 28, John Tyball, on examination before Tunstall, confessed to

¹ Merx illa perniciosissima.

² Cotton MSS., Cleopatra, E. V, p. 362.

having the "New Testament in English, and the Gospel of Matthew and Mark in English,"¹ which he had of John Pykas, of Colchester. The translation of Matthew and Mark, which would form a small thin volume, has been supposed with some plausibility to have been the little treatise that Tyndale conveyed to Munmouth, when he sent for his promised "exhibition." That such a section did exist is highly probable, and it may have been printed as a first experiment at Wittenberg. But the fragment of the quarto has no connection with this earlier issue; for its Prologue refers to all the books of the New Testament as following it, and there is a catalogue of them.

¹ Harleian MSS., p. 421.

CHAPTER VIII.

TYNDALE entered on the momentous and responsible work of translation from noble and disinterested motives. With characteristic self-abnegation he does not obtrude himself in his first preface,¹ but simply says, "The causes that moved me to translate, I thought better that others should imagine than that I should rehearse them." So conscious was he of his integrity, that he fondly hoped to prepare an English New Testament in the palace of the Bishop of London as one of his chaplains. He had thought of the task when he was a domestic tutor, and had then spoken with prophetic rapture of the result. In his preface to the five books of Moses, he argues with earnestness the necessity of a translation, and shows the baseless objections brought against his own. "When I had translated the New Testament, I added an epistle unto the latter end, in which I desired them that were learned to amend, if ought were amiss. But our malicious and wily hypocrites say, some of them, that it is impossible to translate the Scripture in English; some, that it is not lawful for the lay people to have it in their mother tongue; some, that it would make them all heretics; as it would, no doubt, from many things which they of long time have falsely taught, and that is the whole cause why they forbid it, though they other cloaks pretend; and some, or rather every one, say that it would make them rise against the king, whom they themselves (unto their damnation) never yet obeyed." . . . As for my translation, in which they affirm unto the lay

¹ Reprinted separately, with some Pathway into the Holy Scriptures, under the title, "A ture."

people (as I have heard say) to be I wot not how many thousand heresies, so that it cannot be mended or correct; they have yet taken so great pain to examine it, and to compare it unto that they would fain have it, and to their own imaginations and juggling terms, and to have somewhat to rail at, and under that cloak to blaspheme the truth; that they might with as little labour (as I suppose) have translated the most part of the Bible."

His exile and his continuous self-denial were endured for this special and glorious end—the preparation of a New Testament in the island tongue. He was forced to go abroad, to scorn privation, danger, and solitude, that he might translate; but he did not forget his country, for it he toiled and suffered. He protested to Vaughan, the English envoy, in 1531: "Again, may his grace, being a Christian prince, be so unkind to God, which hath commanded His word to be spread throughout the world, to give more faith to wicked persuasions of men, which, presuming above God's wisdom, and contrary to that which Christ expressly commandeth in His Testament, dare say that it is not lawful for the people to have the same in a tongue that they understand; because the purity thereof should open men's eyes to see their wickedness? Is there more danger in the king's subjects than in the subjects of all other princes, which in every one of their tongues have the same, under privilege of their sufferance? As I now am, very death were more pleasant to me than life, considering man's nature to be such as can bear no truth."¹ Not only was he governed by the highest of impulses, but he carried out his task with perfect honesty. In a letter to Fryth, "his dearly beloved brother Jacob," written in 1533, he devoutly and solemnly appeals to God as the witness of his entire conscientiousness: "For I call God to record against the day we shall appear before our Lord Jesus Christ, to give a reckoning of our doings, that I never altered one syllable of God's word against my conscience, nor would this day, if all that is in the earth, whether it be pleasure, honour, or riches, might be given me. Moreover, I take God to record to my conscience, that I desire

¹ Cotton MSS., Titus, B. 1, p. 67, British Museum.

of God to myself, in this world, no more than that without which I cannot keep his laws."¹ Fryth, in his Reply to More, expresses perfect harmony of view: "Tyndale, I trust, liveth well content with such a poor apostle's life as God gave His Son Christ and His faithful ministers in this world, which is not sure of so many mites as ye be of pounds; although, I am sure that, for his learning and judgment of Scripture, he were more worthy to be promoted than all the bishops in England." After quoting a portion of the stirring letter to himself, he then adds: "Judge, Christian reader, whether these words be not spoken of a faithful, clear, and innocent heart. And as for his behaviour, it is such that I am sure no man can reprove him of any sin; howbeit, no man is innocent before God which beholdeth the heart." And he had already delivered an eloquent and bold protest: "This hath been offered you, is offered, and shall be offered. Grant that the Word of God—I mean the text of Scripture—may go abroad in our English tongue, as other nations have it in their tongues, and my brother William Tyndale and I have done, and will promise you to write no more."² With the modesty of a true scholar, and that humility which so befits a translator of the divine volume, Tyndale's appeal in the first preface is, "exhorting instantly, and beseeching those that are better seen in the tongues than I, and that have better gifts of grace to interpret the sense of Scripture and the meaning of the spirit than I, to consider and ponder my labour, and that in the spirit of meekness; and if they perceive in any places that I have not attained the very sense of the tongue or meaning of the Scripture, or have not given the right English word, that they put to their hands to amend it, remembering that so is their duty to do. He was conscious of the imperfections of his work—"many things are lacking which are required," and bespeaks indulgence, on account of "very necessitie and combrance (God is recorde) above strength, which I will not rehearse, lest we should seem to boast ourselves"; referring not only to his anxious and incessant literary toil as a translator, but to his

¹ Foxe, vol. V, 153.

vol. III, p. 344, 339, ed. Russell,

² Works of Tyndale and Fryth, London, 1831.

abrupt flight with the printed sheets from Cologne, and the hurried press work at Worms.

To this ingenuous purity of purpose was united rare scholarly ability, and the English New Testament is conclusive proof of the competence of the workman. Wycliffe was able, a hundred and fifty years earlier, to render only from the Vulgate, the book of the church, and the work sufficed for a time; but Tyndale translated at once from the inspired Greek original, and his learning was quite equal to the task. He had studied both at Oxford and Cambridge during the revival of Greek scholarship, and he had translated an oration of Isocrates so well, at least in his own opinion, that he carried it to London with him as a proof of his proficiency, to be laid before Tunstall, no mean judge. Few priests in his day possessed such knowledge of Greek; very many, "twenty thousand of them, and not so few," could not translate the simplest clause in the Lord's Prayer; but he had enjoyed signal advantages. Sir Thomas More himself witnesses of him, "that before he went over the sea, he was taken for a man of sober and honest living, studious and well learned in Scripture, and looked and preached holily; . . . that before he fell into these phrenzies he was taken for full prettily learned."¹ Tyndale speaks freely and familiarly of various languages, and thus addresses More, "until at the last the lay people had lost the meaning of the ceremonies; and the prelates the understanding of the plain text, and of the Greek, Latin, and especially of the Hebrew. . . . Remember ye not how, within this thirty years and far less, and yet dureth to this day, the old barking curs, Dun's disciples, raged in every pulpit against Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, and what sorrow the school-masters that taught the true Latin had with them?"²

He confidently appeals to Sir Thomas More himself on points of scholarship: "These things be even so Master More himself knoweth, for he understandeth the Greek, and knew

¹ Dialogue, book iv, chap. 17, visitations of Bishop Hooper, that Works, p. 283. many of the clergy could not tell

² Answer to More, p. 75; Works, who was the author of the Lord's vol. III, Parker Society edition. Prayer, or where it was to be It would seem from one of the found.

them long ere I." More never questions his scholarship, and he virtually denies the "Supper of the Lord" to be Tyndale's on account of its lack of learning. When George Joye, who had touched him to the quick by editing and altering his translation, was challenged for his unworthy procedure, he at once measured himself by Tyndale's great erudition, and admitting it, while he dares and defies it, cried, "I am not afraid to answer Tyndale in this matter for all his high learning in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, &c."¹ A famous contemporary, Herman von dem Busche, who was a stranger at the time, and a casual visitor at Worms, bears a similar testimony, which is recorded in the Diary of Georgius Spalatinus, under date the day after St. Laurence Day—that is, 11th August, 1526. Busche told Spalatinus² that Tyndale had edited six thousand English Testaments, and that he was so versed in seven different languages—Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, Britannie, and French—that whichever he spoke you would suppose it was his mother-tongue.³ As he had been some time in Germany his knowledge of German, seen in his use of Luther for the prologue to the quarto Testament, is apparently taken for granted; and as it was the tongue daily spoken by him, it is naturally omitted in the enumeration. That this report is exaggerated⁴ is very probable, but Busche was not a man easily imposed upon. He was the friend of Reuchlin, and one of the three authors of the trenchant *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*.⁵ In a word, Tyndale's reply to Sir Thomas More, in vindication of certain terms adopted by him into his version, is sufficient proof that he was well equipped for the blessed labour which he had taken in hand after reviewing its perils, and to carry out which he had left country and kindred. His ability to translate from the Greek text can, after such testimonies, scarcely be questioned with propriety.

¹ George Joye's work will be described in a subsequent page. *centenis millibus aeris*, which Busche declared the English people to be

² Schelhorn's *Amœnitates Literariæ*, vol. IV, p. 431. willing to pay for six thousand copies of the English Testament.

³ *In ea natum putes.*

⁵ Sir William Hamilton's *Discussions*, &c., p. 226.

⁴ There is an exaggeration in the

Not only was he the translator, but he was the sole translator. He had no literary assistance in his work, no pioneer and no guide; no one to follow and no one to help him. Though he might have had a copy of Wycliffe, it could be of little or no service to him. In the Epilogue to the first edition, he speaks thus: "Them that are learned Christianly I beseech, forasmuch as I am sure, and my conscience beareth me record, that of a pure intent, singly and faithfully I have interpreted it, as far forth as God gave me the gift of knowledge and understanding, that the rudeness of the work now at the first time offend them not; but that they consider how that I had no man to counterfeit,¹ neither was helped with English of any that had interpreted the same or such like thing in the Scripture beforetime. . . . Count it as a thing not having his full shape, but as it were born before his time, even as a thing begun rather than finished. In time to come (if God have appointed us thereunto), we will give it his full shape, and put out, if ought be added superfluously, and add to, if ought be overseen through negligence, and will enforce to bring to compendiousness that which is now translated at the length, and to give light where it is required, and to seek in certain places more proper English, and with a table to expound the words which are not commonly used." . . . No one, after such a clear statement, can doubt that the translation belongs to him as the one workman, or that he first constructed the pattern which so many have followed both in spirit and letter.

But various assistants have been assigned to Tyndale in the execution of his great work. Strype hazards the baseless assertion that Tyndale was assisted by Joye and Constantine,² and the opinion is repeated by Cooper that Constantine assisted Tyndale and Joye.³ The two Englishmen described by Cochläus as being so busy at Cologne, Walter concludes "must have been Tyndale and Fryth."⁴ Froude asserts

¹ Counterfeit here means to imitate, as often in his New Testament, 1st Cor. iv, 16, to counterfeit me; Eph. v, 1, Be ye counterfeiters of God; 1 Thess. i, 6, and ye counterfeited us; 1 Thess. ii, 14, Ye brethren did counterfaite the congregations of God, &c.

² Memorials, vol. I, p. 82.

³ Athenæ Cantab., vol. I, p. 205.

⁴ Letter to Bishop Marsh, p. 143.

"that Joye joined Tyndal at Antwerp, and shared his great work with him."¹ But the first New Testament was not printed at Antwerp, and Joye did not leave England till after its publication; for he printed at "Straszburge" the reason of his recent flight in a small book: "The letters whyche Johan Ashwell, pryour of Newnham Abbey besydes Bedforde, sente secretly to the Byshope of Lyncolne, in the yeaere of our Lorde MDXXVII, wherein the sayde pryour accused George Joye, that tyme being felowe of Peter College in Cambridge, of fower opynyons, with the answeere of the sayde George unto the same opynyons." Lord Herbert also speaks carelessly, of "the Scriptures as having been translated into English by Tindal, Joy, and others."² Holinshed and Baker use similar language in their Chronicles. Johnston and Newcome, two professed historians of the English Bible, give Fryth to Tyndale for his helper, and Fuller calls Fryth the "Baruch to this Jeremy." This erroneous opinion is accepted by Le Long, Crutwell, Lewis, and Dean Hook,³ and by Offor and Dabney in their formal biographies of the Translator. But Fryth, who had been a student at Cambridge, and was brought by Wolsey to his new college at Oxford as one of its canons, did not leave England till long after the New Testament was issued, as he fled from persecution at Oxford in 1528.

Tyndale, however, had an assistant, Friar Roye, but he was only a corrector of proofs and a collator of texts. His light character and his propensity to weave satirical verses were a sore grievance to the translator, who was burdened with the grave responsibility of his work, and anxious not to give any public provocation which might hinder its reception or blight its usefulness. His own account of Roye is at once stern and amusing, as he gives it in the "Preface to the Wicked Mammon," than which, according to Sir Thomas More, "there never was made a more foolish, frantic book":—"While I abode⁴ a faithful companion, which now hath taken another

¹ History, vol. II, p. 31.

² Lives of the Archbishops, vol.

³ History of Henry VIII, p. 469 (A. Murray, London).

II, p. 139, new series.

⁴ Abode—that is, waited for, as in Acts, xx, 23.

voyage upon him, to preach Christ where, I suppose, he was never yet preached (God, which put it in his heart hither to go, send His Spirit hither with him, comfort him, and bring his purpose to good effect), one William Roye, a man somewhat crafty, when he cometh unto new acquaintance, and before he be thorough known—and namely, when all is spent—came unto me, and offered his help. As long as he had no money somewhat I could rule him; but as soon as he had gotten him money, he became like himself again. I suffered all things till that was ended, which I could not do alone without one, both to write and to help me to compare the texts together. When that was ended, I took my leave and bade him farewell for our two lives, and (as men say) a day longer. After we were departed, he went and gat him new friends; which thing to do he passeth all that ever I knew. And there, when he had stored him money, he gat him to Argentine, where he professeth wonderful faculties, and maketh boast of no small things. A year after that, and now twelve months before the printing of this work, came one Jerome, a brother of Greenwich also.¹ Which Jerome I warned of Roye's boldness, and exhorted him to beware of him, and to walk quietly and with all patience, and long-suffering, according as we have Christ and his apostles for an example.

"Nevertheless, when he was come to Argentine (Strasburg), William Roye (whose tongue is able not only to make fools stark mad, but also to deceive the wisest—that is, at the first sight and acquaintance) gat him to him and set him a-work to make rhymes, while he himself translated a dialogue out of Latin into English, in whose prologue he promiseth more a great deal than I fear me he will ever pay."² Tyndale was

¹ The brother so referred to is bold and savage onslaught made upon him, and Cochlaeus comes in also for his share—

² The allusion is to the "proper Dialogue," &c., and to the Satire, "Rede me and be nott wrothe." A littell pratys foolyshe poade, Wolsey, "the red man," "the vile More venomous than any toade." butcher's sonne," must have been p. 43, Arber's reprint, 1871. A copy was found by Lord Arthur Hervey,

most anxious to free his work from all degrading associations, that it might go forth in its own unsullied might and grandeur. His unqualified disclaimer was the more necessary, for Sir Thomas More was inclined at first to impute the authorship of the offensive verses to the translator.

Few helps in the shape of grammars and lexicons were within his reach. But some works of the kind had already appeared, as the Greek Grammar of Lascaris, at Milan, in 1476; Craston's Greek Dictionary, in 1478; and his Grammar, in 1497. The Dictionarium Græcum from the press of Aldus, issued in 1497, and in 1499 the Lexicon of Suidas had been published at Milan. Aleander's Lexicon Græco-Latinum came out at Paris in 1512; and in 1513 Aldus had printed the Institutiones Grammaticæ of Budæus.

The publication of the Greek New Testament by Erasmus formed a great epoch in the history of Western Christendom. He laid the literary world under immense obligations to him by his editions of so many Greek and Latin classics, but his New Testament was a gift of incalculable value to the church. He unsealed the Book of Life, and brought numerous readers face to face with the divine volume. Though he had but few manuscripts, and was even obliged to translate some verses in the last chapter of the Apocalypse from the Latin text of the Vulgate, he did a work which, with all its defects, brought revival to true Biblical theology, and kindled a pure and living flame which "many waters cannot quench, neither can many floods drown." His humorous and satirical Tractates, like his Adages and Colloquies, could not of themselves have produced the profound and necessary changes which were essential to a national Reformation in creed and service. He may have been timid, neutral and indifferent as regards the Lutheran Revolution; his theological writings may not probe the depth of man's spiritual experience and struggles, and, unlike the utterances of a man in deep and earnest thought on the

Bishop of Bath and Wells, in 1862. An original copy of the translation bound up in an old volume. It was of the Dialogue, bound up with the also printed by Whittingham, Chiswick Press, 1845, but not published. Satire, has been recently discovered in the Imperial Library of Vienna.

momentous issue, they may have about them the frosty elegance of a chill intellectual discussion; but any alleged shortcomings and inconsistencies as a reformer cannot detract from his unspeakable merit as a first editor of the Gospels and Epistles in their original tongue, nor lessen the value of that folio which, under his care, issued from the press of Froben at Basle in 1516.

As the version so clearly demonstrates, Tyndale translated directly from the Greek text, using the second and the third editions of Erasmus, published in 1519 and 1522. He admitted the famous passage in 1 John v, 7 about the "three witnesses," which occurs first in the third edition of Erasmus—the two previous editions of 1516 and 1519 omitting it. Tyndale occasionally agrees with the second edition of Erasmus in preference to the first, as in Rom. xii, 11, where, like Luther, he has "applye yourselves to the tyme," instead of "serving the Lord,"¹ and so in his second edition, and in the Great Bible. It was altered first in the Genevan version. The fourth edition (1527) he does not seem to have consulted at all. Erasmus had in his second edition changed "ye kill" into "ye envy" in James iv, 2, but he corrected it in his third edition. Tyndale, however, took it from the second edition, and kept it without amendment in his revised issue; and, like a vile weed which cannot be uprooted, it is found in all the subsequent English versions, in Coverdale, Matthew, the Great Bible, the Genevan, and the Bishops', but it was rightly changed in the Authorized Version.² Tyndale omits in his first edition, without authority, a clause in John xiv, 3, "and if I go and prepare a place for you." No reading adopted by Tyndale betrays any acquaintance with the Complutensian Polyglott.

¹Erasmus having *κρίω* in his first edition, but *καίρω* in his second. written by a drowsy scribe—scriptor dormitans; the Vulgate, however,

²In his first edition Erasmus spoke of *φονεύετε*, "ye kill," as being having *occiditis*.

CHAPTER IX.

BUT the two points to which attention may be called are the relation of Tyndale's New Testament on the one hand to the German Version of Luther, and its relation on the other hand to the Latin Vulgate. It was his duty to use both helps, and he did so. Yet though he carefully and continuously consulted them, he was quite independent in his treatment of them. In direct contradiction of Tyndale's own affirmation that he rendered from the Greek, and of the palpable evidence afforded by the translation itself, it has been asserted that he simply rendered Luther's Testament into English.¹ The story had a natural origin in these early days, when every religious novelty was branded as Lutheran; but it has been often repeated since. Le Long, the learned bibliographer, calls the first edition "The New Testament in English from the German of Martin Luther." The assertion is baseless, though between Luther and Tyndale there are many points of similarity. The order of the books of the New Testament which Tyndale adopted is not that of Erasmus, whose Greek text he translated, but that of Luther, though he never mentions the Reformer's name. Thus,

¹Luther's first intimation of his purpose to translate the New Testament is in a letter to Lange in 1521, and on January of the following year he wrote to Amsdorf, "I will translate the Bible, though I have undertaken a burden too great for my strength;"—"a very necessary work," as he calls it in his reply to King Henry. There had been earlier versions, but their circulation had been small. Luther's translation at once laid hold of the people—being what Hegel calls it in his Philosophy of History, "a people's book, a fundamental work for their instruction." It was published anonymously, and without date.

too, the Epistle of James is put next to Jude, and that to the Hebrews next to the Third Epistle of John, first by Luther and then by Tyndale. He also follows Luther in making the last three verses of the fourth chapter of Hebrews the commencement of the fifth chapter. Many of Tyndale's notes in the first quarto are, as we have seen, translations more or less free of those of Luther. At the close of the long prologue to Matthew, he introduces Luther's opinion on the comparative value of the writings of the New Testament; but what Luther says about the Epistle of James is omitted, for he had called it "a downright strawy epistle," *gegen sie*, "in contrast with them"—the other epistles. Luther had no prologues to the Gospels, while Tyndale has them, though he gives none to the Acts and the Apocalypse. The other prologues rest on Luther's, especially those to 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philipians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 2 Timothy, Titus, and the Epistles of John. But the treatment of the appropriated matter is by no means slavish. The prologue to 1 Corinthians omits many allusions to passing events which the German leader introduced, and that to Philemon keeps out Luther's allegory, which is strained and unscriptural in its doctrine; for it says, "Christ overcame the Father with love and meekness," and thus tends to ignore that eternal and spontaneous love in which the Father gave His Son as Redeemer. The prologue to Hebrews controverts Luther on the apostolic authority of the Epistle, and tries to show that his objections are grounded on "misconceptions of the passages adduced," while it leaves the authorship undetermined—"a man may doubt of the author, yet why should it not be authority, and taken for Holy Scripture?" The prologue to James is also directed against Luther, and maintains that though its canonical authority has been impugned, or "at the beginning refused of holy men," as its purport was misunderstood, "yet, as it is agreeable to all the rest of Scripture, why should it not be authority, and taken for Holy Scripture?" An explanation is added of the paragraph concerning faith and works. The prologue to Jude also vindicates its claim to a place in the canon, "though it seems to be drawn out of the Second Epistle of Peter, and thereto allegeth Scripture nowhere found,"

and these are Luther's two main objections to it. In his prologue to Romans, Tyndale made a scholarly and wise use of Luther's, both in its German and Latin forms.

One peculiarity of Tyndale's Old English is sometimes adduced to show how dependent he was on Luther. The peculiarity so taken hold of is the position, after the verb, of the personal pronoun as a nominative, Matthew xiii, 13, Therefore speak I; Luke ii, 29, Now lettest thou; similarly in 1 Corinthians vii, 12, To the remnaunt speake I; 17, So orden I; ix, 22, Became I as weake; 1 John i, 3, Declare we unto you; and it is to be marked that the idiom is still retained from Tyndale in all these places in the Authorized Version. Bishop Marsh, in trying to prove that "Tyndale's translation was taken at least in part from Luther's" lays undue stress on these examples of what he calls "Germanisms," or direct imitations of German diction.¹ But this order is common in all the old English writers of that age—in Sir Thomas More, and often in Tyndale's own prose. Besides, there are many places in which Tyndale has the idiom where Luther has it not; as in 1 Cor. ix, 26; xii, 31; 2 Cor. vii, 13; xi, 24; 1 Thess. ii, 13; Heb. v, 8; James i, 18. The old form in all these seven verses is still preserved in the Authorized Version, and is opposed to the rendering of Luther who in them places the nominative before the verb. Tyndale has another singularity, for he sometimes omits the nominative of the first person altogether, as in Galatians i, 10, seke nowe, for seek I now; and in 2 Cor. xii, 10, there is the same absence of the pronoun, "have delectation," "I" being left out.

But while Tyndale did not merely "do into English" the German of Luther, he always translated with Luther's version before him, and many phrases are shaped or suggested by it. While such renderings as "Goddess love" (Romans viii, 35), "lest ye fall into hypocrisy" (James v, 12),² "the worlde knoweth you

¹ Lectures on the Criticism and *ὑπὸ κρίσειν*. The wrong rendering is Interpretation of the Bible, p. 518, found also in Tyndale's second edition, of course in Coverdale, and London, 1838.

² Stephens had inserted *εἰς* before in the great Bible; but it was corrected in the Genevan and in the *ὑπὸ κρίσειν*, the true reading being VOL. I. K

nott" (1 John iii, 1), are in Luther, they are also the correct translation by Tyndale of the Greek text of Erasmus. Tyndale's rendering "toward our Lord Jesus" (Acts xx, 21), is also according to Erasmus, a reading which Luther did not adopt, as he preferred the Vulgate. The following are examples of the influence of Luther on Tyndale's version:

Matthew i, 1, this is the boke; Matthew ii, 18, on the hilles was a voyce herde; Matthew xviii, 19, the word "Jesus" is omitted; Matthew xxi, 43, shalbe geven to the gentyles; John xix, 17, the place off deed menns sculles; Acts xxviii, 2, the people off the countre; but in translating the term in 1 Cor. xiv, 11, Tyndale forsook Luther's tamer rendering, and accepts "alient," and "barbarous" in Colossians iii, 11; Acts xxviii, 16, under captayne, chefe captayne Romans i, 14, to the grekes, and to them which are no grekes; Romans ii, 5, harde herte that cannot repent; Romans xi, 13, I will magnify myn office, where the Vulgate agrees with Luther; 1 Cor. i, 25, Godly folysshnes, 11, 14, the natural man; 2 Cor. v, 11, we fare fayre with men; 2 Cor. vi, 12, ye vexe youre selves off a true meanyng; Eph. iii, 15, which is father over all thatt ys called father in heven and in erth; Colossians iii, 16, and spretuall songes which have favour with them; 1 Tim. i, 7, doctours in the scripture; Rev. xi, 2, the quyre which is within the temple; Rev. xxii, 14, their power may be in the tree off lyfe.

But while the assertion that Tyndale only turns Luther into English is utterly erroneous, it has been alleged, on the other hand, that he translated at once and solely from the Vulgate, and not from the Greek text. Thus, Hallam states in a colourless note: "It has been a matter of dispute whether it (the New Testament) were made from the original language or from the Vulgate."¹ Macknight, however, affirms without hesitation that Tyndale translated from the Vulgate, and that, as the subsequent English editions are but revisions of his work, our Authorized Version rests in this way ultimately on

Rheims, which could not avoid the ¹ Constitutional History of Eng- accurate rendering of *ut non sub* land, vol. I, p. 83, note. *judicio decidatis*.

the Latin Bible. He cites Hollybushe's version, and wholly mistakes Coverdale's connection with it, his statement being "the version which Coverdale allowed Hollybushe to print, was the one which he had published in his Bible; consequently, it was Tyndale's translation." The assertion consists of an inexcusable series of blunders. Coverdale, in 1538, had published, for reasons assigned by him, the Latin New Testament, with a literal English translation of it on the same page; and Macknight, in speaking of it, falls into some extraordinary errors.¹ He blunders first, in taking this professed English version of the Vulgate, made for a purpose, to be the New Testament which Coverdale had already published in his Bible; but the Scottish critic had never handled the volumes, or even looked into them, for a few moments' collation must have convinced him that the version in the Diglott is not that of the earlier Bible. A cursory glance at both the versions would have flashed the reality upon him, and taught him that only in supreme carelessness could any one identify, for a moment, Coverdale's translation of the Vulgate with his earlier New Testament. By a second blunder, he leaps to the conclusion that the New Testament of Coverdale's Bible is Tyndale's translation; for though it does base itself on Tyndale's revised edition of 1534, it is yet a distinct version. The same grievous error has been repeated more recently in a Serial of some pretensions: "We have only to add that the real origin of what is commonly called the 'Authorized' English version, explains in a moment the cause of so many defects. It is primarily and essentially the translation of a translation. Wycliffe, who first rendered the Scriptures into English, was unacquainted with Greek or Hebrew, and translated from the Latin Vulgate, so that his work bore more of its imperfections and errors, as well as those of his own judgment in the execution of his work. Succeeding versions (such as those of Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthews, Hollybusche, Cranmer, Taverner, the Geneva, the Bishops', and, lastly, that of the translators nominated by King James in 1604-11) were only superficial attempts to revise the original work of Wycliffe, instead of beginning at the beginning,

¹ A new Literal Translation of the Epistles, &c., London, 1821.

with the original Hebrew and Greek texts."¹ It is astonishing and sad to find such singular charges made at the present day. Not to speak of the subsequent versions at this point, it may be replied that he is surely a bold man who thus ventures to give the lie to William Tyndale, for he affirms that he translated from the Greek text without the assistance of any predecessor, and his work bears out his veracity. Let any one compare it with Wycliffe's version or the Rheims version, both taken from the Latin, and he will soon see the entire and scholarly independence of Tyndale. There needs no other proof. Similar perverse statements are adopted by Granville Penn, who boldly throws out the crude opinion that "in 1526, Tyndale published his revision of the English or Wycliffe New Testament at Antwerp or Hamburg."² The book was printed certainly at neither of these places. The proofs of Latin influence and origin adduced by him are the words Testament, sacrament, altar, sacrifice, Calvary, Diana, Mercury, and masters for teachers; but the introduction of some of these proper names is easily explained from the long use of the Vulgate in the Western Church. He also instances "virtue" in Mark v, 30, Luke vi, 19, viii, 46, as taken from Wycliffe. Wycliffe certainly in those places used "virtue" in no moral sense, but as meaning a secret healing power; but the word is found with that signification in old writers, and the phrase in all parts of the country is still in use, as in the common question, "Is there any virtue in that drug?" Not only was the Latin term naturalized at a very early period, as denoting valour, but the adjective also as meaning salutiferous, as in Shakespeare, "Whose liquor hath this virtuous property;"³ "Like the bee culling from every flower the virtuous sweets."⁴ Another example brought forward by him is the clause "dispersed among the Gentiles," John vii, 35, where it is said Gentiles comes from the Latin *gentium*. But what, then, shall be said of such places as Romans, ii, 9 and 10, where Tyndale

¹ Biblical Notes and Queries, p. 195. Edinburgh, 1871. ³ Midsummer Night's Dream, act iii, scene 2.

² Annotations on the Book of the New Covenant, p. 6, London, 1837. ⁴ King Henry IV, second part, act iv, scene 4.

has "Gentile" though the Vulgate has "Greek" in both places?

To show Tyndale's untrammelled use and treatment of the Vulgate, let us take some places where there are peculiar readings. Luke ii, 14, in the Vulgate, "men of goodwill," but Tyndale has, "and unto men rejoicing," the common Greek reading; Mark xi, 26, and the clause Luke xvii, 36, "Two men shall be in the field," are both omitted by Tyndale, though they are found in the Vulgate. The Vulgate has a clause in Luke xvi, 21, rendered by the Rheims translators, "and no man did give him,"¹ but Tyndale ignores it, though Wycliffe accepted it. In Matt. vi, 1 the Vulgate has *justitiam*, "righteousness," but Tyndale has "alms," and in vi, 11, the Latin has *supersubstantialem*, but Tyndale gives "our daily bread." Like the Vulgate, he omits the doxology to the Lord's Prayer, and the Complutensian Polyglott also omits it; but he inserted it in his revised edition of 1534. In Luke ii, 18, the Vulgate has "and concerning these things,"² but Tyndale follows the Greek text, "wondered at those things." In Matt. xviii, 8, Tyndale follows the Vulgate, and translates "cut him off"; but the singular is also the reading of Erasmus.³ In the same chapter, verse 29, "at his feet" is wanting in Tyndale, and the corresponding Latin phrase is not found in the Vulgate; but the Greek is also wanting in Erasmus of 1522, from which Tyndale usually translated. In Matthew xix, 20, "from my youth," was accepted by Tyndale as it was adopted by Erasmus. In Matt. xxiii, 1, 7, "Rabbi" the second time is rejected by the Vulgate and by Tyndale, but it is not found in Erasmus. In Matt. xxv, 2, the epithet "foolish" stands in the first clause and "wise" in the second, as in the Vulgate, but the same order is also in the text of Erasmus. In Acts ii, 30, the words "according to the flesh—Christ," of the Received Text are omitted, as in the Vulgate; but they are also absent in Erasmus, and the omission is correct. In such cases as these it cannot be asserted that Tyn-

¹ Et nemo illi dabat.

² Et de his.

³ "Them" of the Authorized Ver-

sion represents *αὐτά* in Beza and Stephens.

dale followed the Vulgate, as his version corresponds to the reading of the Greek text of Erasmus. In Acts vii, 60, Tyndale does not accept "in domino" of the Vulgate, but gives simply, as in the Greek, "he fell a slepe." He has not followed sacramentum (Eph. v, 32), for he renders "this is a grete secrete." "Malefactours," (Luke xxiii, 39) is from the Greek, the Latin having "thieves." 1st Tim. iii, 16, the Vulgate has quod, "which," but Tyndale has "God." Though he occasionally refuses the Vulgate, still he often prefers it, as in Matthew xxiv, 3, 7, where pestilence is placed before hunger, that order not being found in Erasmus or in any early Greek edition.¹ If he has accepted the Vulgate in the rendering "blindness" in Eph. iv, 18, he had not taken it in John x, 16, for he translates not "one folde,"² but "one flocke." Fold came in with the great Bible in 1539, the Bishops' kept it, and even both Genevan versions have "shepefolde." In Jude 12, "spots," instead of the proper rendering "rocks," is from the Vulgate, and Tyndale was followed by all his successors. "Jesus" is omitted in Matt. i, 18, after the Vulgate; but it is inserted in the edition of 1534.

But, while Tyndale does not implicitly follow the Vulgate, it suggested many renderings to him, and was continually before him:—

Matt. iv, 5, pinnacle of the temple; Mark v, 34, be whole off thy plage, as also in Rev. xxii, 18;³ Mark xii, 44, they all putt in of their superfluite; Luke ii, 13, a multitude of heavenly sowdiers; ix, 62, and loketh back is apte to the kyngdom of god; xi, 13, Howe moche more shall your father celestiall geve a good sprete; xii, 20, this night will they fetch awaye thy soul again from thee—the Greek verb being plural, and "again" suggested by "rēpetunt"; 45, my master wyll differe his commynge; xvi, 22, 23, buried in hell; xxiii, 39,

¹ "Pestilentie" is not found in the old Latin of the Codex Palatinus, nor in the Latin of the Codex Beza. Critical editions now reject it also from the Greek on good authority.

² The Vulgate has "ovile," but the old Latin has "grex," the Greek being ποιμνη—Luther having rightly "eine Heerde und ein Hirte."

³ But the Greek itself has here πληγὰς in this place.

the one of the malefactoures which hanged rayled on hym, "malefactors," being rendered "evil-doers" in a previous verse; John i, 5, comprehened; ix, 22, for the iewes had conspyred a allredy; xii, 26, Yf eny man mynistre vnto me; xiv, 2, In my father's house are many mansions; xviii, 38, I fynde in him no cause at all; Acts viii, 2, dressed Steven; Rom. ii, 9, tribulation and anguish; vii, 8, wrought in me. . . . concupiscence; 1 Cor. xii, 23, which we think least honest, honest in the Latin sense of honourable; Galatians ii, 11, was worthy to be blamed; iii, 10, are vnder malediccion, but in verse 13 the noun is rendered curse; Eph. vi, 14, gyrd about with veritie; Coloss. i, 13, translated; 2 Thess. iii, 6, every brother that walketh inordinately; 1 Tim. vi, 17, that they be not exceedynge wys; Hebrews ii, 1, lest we be spilt; iii, 14, so that we kepe sure vnto the end the begynninge of the substance; vii, 24, hath an everlasting presthood; ix, 21, all the ministrynge vessels; xii, 1, let us run unto the battayle that is set before us; followed in Coverdale, the great Bible, and the Bishops'. The earlier editions of the Authorized Version have "unto the race"; the present reading, "run the race," appeared first in the Genevan.¹ 1 Peter ii, 1, the Vulgate is followed closely; Rev. xviii, 14, and the apples that thy soll lusted after; xxii, 2, was there the wode of lyfe. Though Erasmus adopted in Rev. xii, 1, the reading "burning"² in their forehead, in the first, second, and third editions, Tyndale did not adopt it, but chose the Vulgate.³

One characteristic defect of the version is its continuous omission of the connecting Greek particles. The δέ is very often neglected, and even γάρ and καί are also frequently passed over. Thus δέ is omitted throughout the genealogy in the first chapter of Matthew, οὖν is omitted in verse 17, γάρ in verse 18, and δέ in verses 20, 21, 22, 23. In the second chapter γάρ is neglected in verse 2, and of the omission of δέ it supplies similar examples. δέ is omitted five times in Matthew iii, verse 3, in 4 twice, and in 10, 15; γάρ is omitted in verse 2 and 3;

¹ Beza "stadium decurramus." ² Καίόμενον. ³ Scriptum.

has no place in verse 11. Indeed every chapter of the New Testament is marked by this uniform neglect.

Occasionally in the version, as might be expected in such an adventurous and untried attempt, there are incorrect renderings. The following are samples:—

Matthew i, 18, hys mother Mary was maryed to Joseph; 19, Joseph being a perfect man; ii, 12, in their slepe, and also in 22;¹ ~~24~~² sought the chyldes deeth; xiii, 8, some fifty-fold; 19, the evyll man; xix, 28, in the second generacion; xxi, 43, geven to the gentyles.

Mark iv, 8, forty-fold; 21, under a busshel, or vnder the borde.

Luke i, 3, the goode Theophilus.

John i, 1, God was that worde; v, 2, by the slaughter housse a pole.

Acts xiii, 42, bitwene the saboth dayes; xvii, 18, a tydynges brynger off newe devyls; xix, 37, robbers off churches; xx, 21, faith tawarde our lorde Jesu; xxvii, 9, alsoo that we had overlonge fasted; xxviii, 28, consolacioun of God.

Romans xii, 19, give rounge unto the wrath of God.

1 Corinthians xiv, 29, two atonce, or thre atonce.

Galatians iv, 5, we thorowe eleccion; 9, the weake and bedgarly cerimones; 25, and bordreth apon the citie; v, 5, iustified by the sprete which commeth of fayth.

Ephesians i, 4, chosen us in him throwe love; iv, 18, blindness of their hertes (after Luther and the Vulgate); v, 19, spirituall songes which have favour with them.

Philippians ii, 8, was found in his aparell as a man; iii, 2, Beware of dissencion—"the concision."

Colossians ii, 18, in the humbleness of angels; among the "errours" at the end of the volume it is said, "rede humblenes and holynes of angels"; 23, chosen holynes and humblenes (Luther misunderstood).

1 Thessalonians v, 22, abstayne from all suspicious thynges.

2 Thessalonians i, 10, beleved even the same day that we preched it.

1 Timothy iii, 2, honestly aparelled; 6, "a yonge man,"

¹ Tyndale omits in somnis, v. 19.

instead of "a novice;" v, 4, to ruele their owne houses godly.

2 Timothy iv, 1, at his appearing in his kingdom—different both from Luther and the Vulgate.

Titus ii, 3, that they be in soche rayment as be commeth holynes.

1 John v, 21, Babes kepe yourselves from ymages.

Hebrews vi, 11, the encrease of the fayth; vii, 20, And for this cause itt is a better hope, that it was not promysed without an othe; vii, 24, an everlastyng presthode; ix, 1, iustifynges and servynges off God and worldly holynes; xi, 3, That by the means of thynges whych apeare, thynges whych are invisibyl myghte be knowen; xii, 7, God offereth him selfe unto you as unto sonnes; xii, 11, no manner learnynge seemeth to be ioyeous.

James i, 27, visit the frendlesse; iii, 7, are meked and tamed.

Revelation vi, 8, beholde a grene horse; vii, 14, made their garmentes large and made them whyte; xii, 6, M and xxvj is evidently a misprint, and the number is given correctly in xi, 3. In Rev. iv, 6, &c., there was admitted the unfortunate "bestes" which has survived through all revisions.

Tyndale, ever anxious to give the sense, did not scruple to fill up what he regarded as an ellipse; and he has paraphrases which, as they interpret rather than translate, weaken the sense and blunt the incisiveness of his style. Interpolations are sometimes introduced.

Matthew iii, 8, belongynge to repentaunce; vii, 6, and the other turn again; viii, 4, commaunded to be offred; 26, endowed with lytell faithe; xii, 20, flaxe that begynneth to burne; 46, stode without the dores; xxiii, 15, to brynge one in to your belefe, (to make one proselyte).

Mark i, 24, that holy man promysed of god; xii, 36, David hym silfe inspyred with the holy goost sayd.

Luke xv, 2, He receaveth to his company synners; xxiv, 47, the begynnynge must be at Jerusalem.

John i, 14, And that worde was made flesshe; iii, 5, boren of water and of the sprete (the preposition not being repeated, and there being no article to either noun); xix, 14, Hitt was

the saboth even which falleth in the ester fest; ix, 3, nor yet his father and mother.

Acts vii, 60, For they wote not what they do; viii, 27, a man of etheopia which was gelded; ix, 28, had his conversacion with them att Jerusalem; x, 1, a captaine of the soudyers of Ytaly; 14, God forbyd, lorde; 18, And he called out won, and axed whether Simon, which was also called Peter, were lodged there; xvi, 16, her master and mastres (and so in the second edition, in Coverdale, and in the Great Bible—the correction being made in the Genevan); xvii, 11, these were the noblest among them off Thessalonia; in the Great Bible, “noblest of birth.”

Romans i, 4, sence the tyme that Jesus Christ oure Lorde rose againe; ii, 18, and hast experience of good and bad; v, 5, be cause the love that God hath vnto us is sheed; vi, 19, I wyll speake grossly; vii, 6, in an newe conversacion of the sprete; viii, 23, and loke for the deliveraunce of oure bodies; 26, gronynges which cannot be expressed with tonge; x, 3, rightwesnes which is of value before God; xii, 11, let not that busynes which ye have in honde be tedious to you; xiii, 11, I mean the season how that it is tyme; xiv, 1, nott in disputyng and troublunge his conscience; xiv, 20, Destroye not the work off God for a lytell meates sake.

1 Corinthians i, 12, I holde of Paul.

2 Corinthians v, 21, thatt we by his meanes shoulde be that rightwesnes which before God is alowed; xii, 7, there was given unto me of God vnquyetnes of the flesshe.

Ephesians i, 17, and open to you the knowledge of hym silfe; iv, 12, that the saintes might have all thynges necessary to work and minister with all.

1 Thessalonians ii, 10, that noman coulede blame us; 2 Thess. ii, 14, “the glory that commeth of oure Lorde Jesu Christ.”

1 Timothy vi, 5, superfluous disputynges in scolus (schools); 6, Godlines is great ryches, yf a man be content with that he hath.

Titus i, 7, a bisshoppe must be soche as no man can complayne on; iii, 14, goode workes as farforth as nede requyreth.

1 John iv, 1, whether they be of God or no.

1 Peter i, 13, the grace that is brought vnto you in that Jesus Christ is opened; iv, 11, Yf eny man speake let him talke as thoughe he speake the wordes of God.

2 Peter ii, 16, The tame and dom beast.

Hebrews vi, 1, the doctryne pertaynyng to the begynnyng of a Christen man; xi, 19, as an ensample of the resurrection; xi, 31, receaved the spyes to lodgyng peasably; xii, 16, solde his right that belonged unto him in that he was the eldest brother.

James i, 17, with whom is no variablenes, nether is he chaunged vnto darknes; v, 17, Helias was a man in daunger to tribulacion, as we are (in the edition of 1534, “mortal even as we are”); “under infirmities as we are,” Great Bible.

Revelation xvii, 3, I sawe a woman sytt apon a rose colored best.

Tyndale has sometimes a peculiar homeliness, as when he uses familiar terms, and especially those of the English Kalendar, or of ecclesiastical nomenclature.

Matthew xxvi, 2, ye knowe that after two dayes shalbe ester; 30, And when they had sayd grace; xxvii, 62, the next daye that foloweth good frydaye.

1 Corinthians xvi, 8, I will tarry att Ephesus vntill Witson-tyde.

Revelation i, 10, I was in the sprete on a sondaye.

This translation of Matthew xxvii, 41, “Likewise also the prelates mocking him,” looks like a side-glance at home, but was changed in his next revised edition. Acts xiii, 15, after the lecture (reading of the law), . . . if ye have eny sermone to exhort the people, say on; Acts xiv, 13, “brought oxen and garlondes vnto the churche porche”; 1 Peter v, 3, lordes over the parisshe.

There occur other quaint terms. Acts xvi, 35, the officers sent the ministers sayinge, lett theose men goo; xvii, 34, Dionisius a senatour; Hebrews xii, 16, which for one breakfast solde his right; 1 Timothy iii, 16, without nay great is that mystery of godliness; Mark xii, 2, he sent to the tennauntes a servaunt; Luke xx, 9, lett it forth to fermers; Luke vi, 29,

him that taketh awaye thy goune; 1 Peter i, 5, unto helth, which health is prepared; Luke xvi, 6, Take thy bill.¹

But there are also remarkably good renderings which have not been preserved.

Matt. xiii, 19, 20, 22, he that was sown.

Mark i, 19, dresseyng their nettes; ii, 22, olde vesselles; vi, 14, therfore myracles worke in hym.

Luke ii, 52, increased in wisdom and age; vii, 28, lesse in the kyngdom of God; xvi, 21, to be refreshed with the cromes; xxii, 44, droppes of blood tricklyng doune to the ground.

John ii, 3, when the wyne fayled; iii, 3, except that a man be boren a newe; viii, 4, even as the dede was a doing.

Acts ii, 23, by the hondes of vnrightewes persones.

1 Thessalonians iv, 14, them also which slepe by Jesus, and so in Coverdale—"in Jesus" being introduced by the Genèvean.

2 Thessalonians ii, 8, shalle destroye with the aparence of his commynge.

1 Timothy ii, 8, I will therefore that the men praye, the article being wrongly dropped in Coverdale, and in the Authorized Version—"the men," in contrast with "the women."

Hebrews xi, 13, the promises . . . and saluted them—"embraced them" in the Authorized Version.

Many of Tyndale's translations are very happy, and even where they are not exact they are specimens of pithy, idiomatic English. Indeed, the whole version is perspicuous and easily understood, few of its words are obsolete or uncommon—not more perhaps than ten in every hundred verses; probably in all considerably under four hundred. Many of his words and phrases have been preserved, but many have been toned down, the rich colouring having been bleached out of them, and others have passed away in the subsequent revisions.

Matthew iv, 10, avoyd Satan; 24, divers diseases and gripinges; vi, 7, bable not moche; viii, 18, to go over the water;

¹Wycliffe in verse 6 has "obligacioun" in the first version, but "caucion" in the second after the Vulgate; but both have "lettris" in verse 7, also after the Vulgate. The Rheims version follows Tyndale, while the Genèvean employs "writing" in both verses.

x, 9, nor brasse yn youre gerdels; xiii, 27, goode seede in thy crosse; 33, hyd in thre peckes off meeles; 52, every scribe which is cominge vnto the kyngdom of heven; xiv, 14, his herte dyde melt vppon them; 20, gaddered vp of the gobbetes; xv, 27, the whelppes eate of the crommes; xvii, 17, O generacioun, faythles and croked; 27, thou shalt fynd a piece of twelve pens; xxi, 24, if ye asoyle me; xxiv, 12, iniquite shall have the vpper honde; xxv, 43, I was herbroulesse; xxvi, 17, to eate the ester lambe; xxvii, 3, thirty plattes off sylver; 11, and the debite axed him.

Mark v, 13, the heerd starteled; 35, why diseasest thou the master; vi, 27, sent the hangman; 36, go in to the tonnes and bye them breed; 40, sat doune here arowe and there arowe; 53, and drue up vnto the haven; vii, 4, wasshinge of cuppes and cruses; viii, 19, howe many baskettes of the levings of broken meate toke ye up? 29, thou arte very Christ; xiv, 51, cloothed in linnen apon the bare; 65, arede vnto vs; 66, won off the wenches off the hiest preste.

Luke ii, 3, his awne shyre toun; vi, 4, halowed breed; vii, 2, the servaunt . . . whom he made moche of; viii, 42, she laye a dyinge; x, 34, brought hym to a commen hostry; xi, 46, yourselves touche not the packes; xiv, 18, I have bought a ferme; xv, 8, what woman havyng ten grotes; 16, filled his bely with the coddess that the swyne ate;¹ xxii, 1, the feaste of swete bread drue nye, whych is called ester.

John i, 30, for he was yer then I; ii, 7, fylled them vp to the harde brym; ix, 18, the iewes did not beleve off the felowe; xviii, 3, with lanterns and fyerbrondes; xix, 2, the soudiers woude a croune of thornes.

Acts iv, 11, the stone cast a syde; xii, 18, there was not lytell a doo amonge the soudiers; xix, 12, napkyns or partlettes; xxi, 24, do cost on them; xxvii, 39, they spied a certayne reache with a banke; xxviii, 7, had a lordshippe.

Romans vii, 3, she couple her silfe with another; xiii, 7,

¹He uses the phrase "fed her with them but the shales and husks of shales and cods" in his Exposition of men": Shakespeare, Henry V, act the Sermon on the Mount—shales iv, scene 2. meaning shells or husks. "Leaving

Geve to every man his duetie; xii, 2, but be ye chaunged in youre shape by the renuyng of your wittis.

1 Corinthians ii, 10, searcheth the bottom of goddes secretes; iv, 9, My thynketh that god hath showed us; v, 7, that ye maye be newe dowe as ye are swete breed; vi, 10, nether pillers shall inherit—still found in the word pillage; vii, 34, The single woman; ix, 13, have their fyndyng of the temple? 22, In all thyng I fassioned my silfe to all; xiv, 1, Labour for love.

2 Corinthians ii, 17, For we are not as many are, which choppe and chaunge¹ with the worde of god; x, 10, his speache whomly; xii, 16, Did I pill you? 20, lest there be founde amonge you lawynge.

Ephesians ii, 14, that was a stoppe bitwene vs; v, 19, playnge to the lorde.

Philippians i, 8, I longe after you all from the very herte rote in Jesus Christ; 23, I desyre to be lowsed, and to be with Christ.

Colossians ii, 1, as many as have not sene my parson in the flesshe; iii, 21, Fathers rate not your children.

1 Thessalonians iv, 15 and 16, we shall live . . . shall not come yerre they which sleep.

2 Thessalonians i, 3, every one of you swymmeth in love; ii, 6, might be vttered at his tyme,—that is, detected, as often in Tyndale's works, and also in Foxe, as denoting the act of an informer.

1 Timothy i, 2, Vnto Timothe hys naturall² sonne; ii, 9, lykwyse also the wemen that they arraye them selves in manerly aparell with shamfastness; iii, 2, harberous; iv, 7, cast awaye vngostly and olde wyves fables; v, 4, fyrst to ruele their owne houses godly; vi, 4, but wasteth his braynes about questions; vi, 20, avoyde vngostly vanities of voyces.

Titus ii, 5, chast, huswyfly, good.

¹ This phrase is used by him in natural affection—"who doeth out the Parable of the Wicked Mammon. of pure love that he doeth." But the Greek adjective denotes genuine,

² The epithet occurs in the "Pathway" to denote a child that has true Timothy being a true spiritual child.

2 Peter ii, 13, they make a mockyng stoke feastyng togedder.

1 John ii, 16, the prydde of gooddess.

Hebrews viii, 1, this is the pyth, x, 34, toke a worth the spolyng off youre goodes; xi, 12, of one, and of one which was as good as dead.

James i, 1, which are scattered here and there.

The translation, as a first and individual effort, is wonderful in many points of view. Tyndale had few appliances in the shape of grammars and lexicons;¹ but he devoted himself to his daily work with singular earnestness and assiduity. He often keeps the proper translation of the aorist, where succeeding translators have given it the sense of the perfect. The English is racy Saxon, and much of it, sometimes clause after clause, with no change save in spelling, is yet preserved in our common version. It has a noble unaffected simplicity, and the ring of genuine English idiom. It is more definite and concise than the current style of his day, and even of his own polemical writings. He may run that reads, and he that reads may understand, and the typical "ploughboy" may gather the sense so given in his own tongue. The eulogy of Fuller is not overdrawn: "What he undertook was to be admired as glorious; what he performed to be commended as profitable; wherein he failed, is to be excused as pardonable, and to be scored on the account rather of that age, than of the author himself."²

There are, of course, numerous archaic forms, and the spelling also is very irregular, many of the proper names in the first chapter of Matthew not beginning with a capital letter, especially in the quarto, and, indeed, there is an utter want of uniformity in the spelling of the octavo also. We have, it, hit, hyt; of, and off; go, and goo; so, and soo; one, and woon; te, and the; other and wother; brydde, for bird; hoot coles; wholly goost, &c. Y is generally used for the more modern i, and dd for the more modern th. There occur also, whithersumever, rightwesness, leugh hym to scorn; rot, for rost; sheet, for shut; nowth for nought; fayght, for faith; littel wones; yerbis; axe, for ask. Syllables are separated that ought to be united, and

¹ See p. 141. ² Church History of Britain, vol. II, p. 90.

united that should be kept apart; and even monosyllables are divided at the end of a line. Proper names sometimes begin with small letters, and common nouns with capitals, presenting such anomalies as these—"iewry and galile, and samary" (Acts ix, 31); Athens, Corinthum (1 Cor. xviii, 1); "better to Mary then to bourne" (1 Cor. vii, 9), "noo rotes; goo awaye." There is at the end of the volume a list of "errours comitted in the prentyng." The list contains seventy instances; some of them are mere misprints from the similarity of the angular letters, others are corrections, as then for them, had for hath, straythie for straightly. But some of the errors noted in the table do not exist, and others are not quoted correctly.

Tyndale's life had been an anticipation of Goethe's utterance, "lofty heights must be ascended by winding paths." The enterprise which he had purposed at Little Sodbury,¹ and which he had dreamed of carrying out in London, was commenced at Cologne, and being suddenly interrupted there, was brought to a successful conclusion at Worms. All difficulties had been at length surmounted, and the volumes on being finished at press, were at once safely and secretly despatched to England. The ships that brought the Testaments to this country are unknown, as well as the ports from which they sailed, and the ports at which they delivered their unsuspected cargo. Nor are we acquainted with the means first employed to convey the books from the vessels, and throw them into circulation. But the distribution, once begun, went on swiftly; "the little hidden leaven" soon began to leaven "the whole lump."

¹ Camden, referring to Tyndale's Testament." Britannia, vol. I, p. sojourn at Little Sodbury, quietly 276, ed. Gough, London, 1789. adds, "and here translated the New

CHAPTER X.

THE precious volumes may have arrived in England in the spring or early summer of 1526, and any more definite assertion is only conjecture, even though the reckoning were made by the Old Style, which carried the end of the year to the last week of March. Many statements on this debated point want precision. Foxe mentions vaguely that Garret brought Tyndale's New Testament to Oxford about the year of our Lord 1526; but forgetful of what he had stated, he affirms in another place, that Tyndale first translated the New Testament "for the profit of the simple vulgar people" about A.D. 1527.¹ Joye is as indeterminate as Foxe, for, referring, at the end of 1534 or beginning of 1535, to the octavo, he says: "Thou shalt know that Tyndale, about eight or nine years ago, translated and printed the New Testament, without calendar or concordances."² But the date assigned by Christopher Anderson, D'Aubigné, and others, either the close of 1525, or the very beginning of 1526, cannot be sustained, for the following reasons:—

First, There is no ground for doubting the testimony of Cochläus who was himself present, and made minute personal inquiries. The insurrection of the peasants, which broke out in Swabia on the 19th of July, 1524, and had extended to Frankfort by the middle of 1525, had driven him, a dean of the "Church of the Blessed Virgin" in that city, first to Mentz, and then to Cologne, where he abode for a time in busy seclusion. Tyndale had also come to the same city in the summer of 1525, and as both he and the fugitive dignitary

¹ Vol. V, p. 421, p. 119.

² Apologie, fol. civ.

were employing the same printers, Cochläus incidentally made the discovery about the mysterious volumes at press. Now, that discovery, as he asserts, was made soon after the despatch of Luther's letter to King Henry VIII, and it was dated 1st September, 1525. The printing had therefore begun some time before that period,¹ and consequently it must have been far on in September, or in October, when Tyndale fled away with the sheets to Worms, to avoid the frustration of his labour. Though the utmost expedition possible at that early time had been used, several months must have been consumed in the printing of the octavo and the completing of the quarto. In all likelihood the books could scarcely be ready for exportation before March or April. Cochläus affords yet another test. In his letter to James V of Scotland, dated 8th June, 1533, he boasts that, eight years before, he had interrupted the printing of the New Testament at Cologne, and thus points to the summer or autumn of 1525.

Second, The supposition that the New Testaments had arrived in January, 1526, does not allow sufficient time for the activity of Garret and other distributors. Garret must have been busy for a period in London, before he went down to Oxford, where he sold the books to "divers scholars," and "remained a while." But his industry had come to light; and search being made for him in the capital, his journey to Oxford was discovered, and measures were at once taken to arrest him in the University. This record of labour and travel on the part of Garret, and of information received and acted on by Wolsey and Tunstall, necessitates an interval of more than three weeks—all that Anderson's theory really allows. Besides, the volumes had been so long in Oxford, before the capture of Garret, that through the study of them there had been formed, prior to that event, "a tender and lately born little flock," so organized that its members called one another "brethren." These results could not have been produced in the single month of January; and it was in February that the search was instituted, though not in February, 1526.

Third, It was not till the metropolis had been explored in

¹ Sheets had been printed as far as the letter K. See page 129.

vain for Garret, that instructions were sent from Wolsey to seize him at Oxford. These orders were formally addressed, through Higden, Dean of Cardinal College, to Cottysford as commissary of the University, and he at once obeyed them. But Cottysford could not act as commissary or vice-chancellor in February, 1526, for he was not sworn into office till the 7th of December, 1527.¹ The commissary easily caught Garret, and confined him in his own chamber; but when he went out to "evensong," the prisoner "put back the bar of the lock with his finger" and escaped. He was, however, soon seized near Bristol, through the agency of a chapman of that city, the father-in-law of Cole the university proctor; and Cole had given secret notice to Garret and other friends of the intended search.

Fourth, Henry sent first a Latin letter in reply to that of Luther, which he had received on the 20th of March, 1526, "after which letter written and sent him, the king translated it into English, of an especial favour toward his subjects." In the preface to the English letter he refers to the New Testament as being in the country, and calls immediate attention to many corruptions of the holy text, as "certain prefaces and other pestilent glosses in the margin" of the quarto. The Latin epistle was, however, not despatched till late in the year, and on 30th November, 1526, Sir John Wallop apparently acknowledges to Wolsey the receipt of it—"two packets of Luther's matters."² Immediately on its translation the English letter was printed by R. Pynson,—finished on the 2nd December, 1526.³ The king's criticism of the New Testament, and the avowal of his purpose that, on consultation with Wolsey, and other reverend fathers of the spirituality, "the said untrue translation should be burned," imply that the Testaments had come somewhat recently into the country, and that they had been widely dispersed.

Fifth, Anderson's argument implies the extraordinary supposition, that King Henry answered Luther's epistle on the

¹ Le Neve's Fasti, vol. III, p. 475, ed. Duffus Hardy.

² State Papers, vol. I, p. 173.

³ A copy of this letter is in the Bodleian Library, and it is also printed in Herbert's Ames, p. 297.

very day on which he received it; for in allusion to Luther's letter, and the day of its reception, he exclaims, "Here, then, was Tyndale's quarto New Testament with glosses denounced as early as 20th March, 1526." The history of the royal letter, given in the previous sentences, disposes at once of the conjecture. Nor could the New Testaments be burned, as he asserts, on the 11th of February, 1526, for the reason already given, that they could not by that time have reached the English shores, and still less could Garret have received them, and begun to distribute them so early as January. Tyndale, in his "Obedience of a Christian Man," and in a personal attack on Bishop Fisher whose sermon he is reviewing, says, for the sake of "a like argument, Rochester and his holy brethren have burned Christ's testament." But does Tyndale here mean by "Christ's testament" his own translation? Does he ever call it by such a name? The word "testament" does not occur at all in the epilogue to the octavo, though in the prologue to the quarto he often mentions the "New Testament."¹

Sixth, The authorities being roused by reports of New Testaments in individual and domestic use, resolved upon a vigorous and simultaneous search after the terrible book in the capital and in the universities. Anderson, and those who accept his premises, lay no small stress on this process as a proof of the early advent of the version, and date it in February, 1526, when the volumes could not by any possibility have arrived. Such inquisitorial and stealthy work certainly shows that the books had been for some considerable time in circulation; but the search dated by Anderson in 1526 could not have taken place at Oxford at that time: for, 1st, as has been shown in a previous paragraph, Dr. Cottysford, rector of Lincoln College, who was concerned in the transaction, and who acted under instructions sent from Wolsey to him as commissary or vice-chancellor of Oxford, was not officially installed till the 7th of December, 1527. 2nd, Dr. London, warden of New College, in writing to Longland, Bishop of

¹ Anderson gets point to his in- thus,—*have burned Christ's Testament* by printing the clause *ment*.

Lincoln, as Oxford then belonged to that diocese, intimated that the commissary had revealed "the matter" of Garret's arrest and escape to him, "on this Monday the vigil of St. Matthias." But in 1526, St. Matthias day fell on a Saturday, its vigil therefore being on the previous Friday, while in 1528 it fell on a Tuesday, so that its vigil was on the day indicated—a Monday. 3rd, in another letter written two days later, that is, on the 26th of February, Dr. London asserts that "this unhappy Mr. Garret had been at Oxford last Easter distributing books," and adds, "I fear Mr. Clark was his caller to Oxford." Now, to one writing in February, "last Easter" must be Easter of the previous year, or, in Anderson's baseless opinion, that of 1525. But the chronology breaks down at once, for Clark¹ himself was not incorporated at Oxford till October 5th, 1525, and could not therefore some months before have invited Garret to the university. The Easter referred to must therefore have been that beginning on April 21st, 1527. 4th, Bishop Longland, in conveying the information about Garret to Wolsey, writes on "Ash Wednesday," which in 1526 was the 14th of February, or before St. Matthias day, that is really before the date of the letter, in consequence of the receipt of which he was sending his epistle; but in 1528, Ash Wednesday happened two days after St. Matthias day,² or on February 26th or 27th. 5th, Dalaber, indeed, in his interesting and touching story of Garret's capture, dates the occurrence in 1526 or thereabouts. But he wrote from memory more than thirty years afterwards, in 1562, and he corrects his own mistake when he thus notes the period, "Master Ball, of Merton College, and Master Cole, of Magdalene College, being proctors in the month of February." Now Ball became proctor only on the 10th of April, and therefore could not have acted in the preceding February; and as

¹ Clark was one of those students imprisoned in the cellar under Cardinal College, and he died shortly afterwards.

² St. Matthias day falls on the 24th of February, but in leap year on the 25th; and it is still observed

on that day in the Church of Rome. The discussion as to the proper day of its observance in leap year, and its connection with the old Julian year, may be seen in Wheatley's "Common Prayer," p. 248, Bohn's edition, and also in Demaus and Arber.

Cole became proctor on the 7th of May, 1527, and held the appointment till April, 1528, he was senior proctor at the time when the seizure of Garret created such academic sensation.¹ 6th, Tyndale himself verifies the same conclusion in the words employed by him in his "Preface to the Parable of the Wicked Mammon," printed by Hans Luft at Marburg. He intimates in reference to Roye, "I could not do alone, without one both to write and to help me to compare the texts together. When that was done, I took my leave of him for our two lives." Roye accordingly did not linger after being so summarily shaken off, but left at once. In this book, the printing of which was finished 8th May, 1528, Tyndale goes on to speak of a visit of Jerome, "a brother of Greenwich also," as taking place "a year after," that is a year after Roye's departure, and "now twelve months before the printing of this work." The translator himself thus clearly places Roye's dismissal and the completion of the New Testament about April or May, 1526. Foxe gives the date of the "Wicked Mammon" in his reprint of Tyndale's Works as 1527, and he has been followed by Tanner, Lewis, Wood, and Walter. But the colophon of the book itself has the date 1528; and Anderson, whose chronology is so sadly disturbed by this fact, imagines that there must have been a first edition issued at Worms, somewhat strangely, in the very same month and day of the previous year. Lastly, other evidence from the episcopal registers on this point seems also conclusive. It is true that John Pykas, a baker of Colchester, whose witness has already been cited on another point, confessed before Tunstall on the 7th of March, 1528, that "about two years last past, he bought of a Lombard of London a New Testament, and paid for it four shillings, which New Testament he kept, and read through many times." But as he does not say

¹ Anthony Dalaber himself communicated the first part of the story to Foxe, but it was left unfinished by his death in 1562, the martyrologist gathering "the residue from ancient and credible persons." Garret, on being condemned, abjured,

and bore his faggot along with others, a great fire being made on the top of Carfax, and each of the accused persons as he passed it threw a book into the flames. Garret suffered bravely some years afterwards.

two years and more, he probably means within the period, and his mental calculation may have been somewhat confused, for he was under examination by a stern and powerful judge. But though the term "about" gives vagueness to his calculation, it does not contradict our arguments. The confession of Tyball also leads back to an early part of 1526, and that of Munmouth is similar. Necton, on examination in 1528, deposed that "about a yere and a half agon, he fell in acquaintance with Vicar Constantine here in London. Which showed this respondent first, that the said Mr. Fyshe had New Testaments to sell; and caused this respondent to by some of the said New Testaments of Mr. Fyshe."¹ All these lines of proof seem to determine that the time when the volumes arrived in England was in the early part of the summer of 1526.

The circulation was carried on by hidden and unexpected agencies, and Testaments were freely disposed of in most unlikely places. Prior Barnes, who on Christmas eve, 24th December, 1525, had from the pulpit of St. Edward's Church, Cambridge, inveighed against Wolsey's "golden shoes, pole axes, pillars, golden cushions, crosses, and red gloves," was seized, brought to London, and "by persuasions mighty in the sight of reason and foolish flesh," he had been induced to recant. On the 11th February, 1526, he was led out to do penance in presence of the "Cardinal, clothed in purple like a bloody antichrist, with six and thirty abbots, mitred priors, and bishops." Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, preached, and great basketfuls of books, not called English Testaments "were standing before them within the rails, which were commanded, after the great fire was made before the Rood of Northen, there to be burned."² Wolsey might, in Tyndale's phrase, be "the falsest and vainest cardinal that ever was," despotic and cruel as a ruler, and unscrupulous as a diplomatist, plotting with all craft and assiduity for the occupancy of St. Peter's chair, and he might be concerned in the burning of books, but he never burned human beings. He said, indeed, to Barnes, "Abjure or be burnt," and the friar

¹ The depositions are given in ed. Oxford, 1822.

Strype's Memorials, vol. I, p. 113, ² Foxe, vol. V, p. 418.

accepted the first alternative. Whatever hand he might have in sending to the block the Duke of Buckingham, High Constable of England, and a descendant of Edward III, he did not of his own act doom any one to the flames for difference of religious opinion. The stake resumed its fatal prominence under his philosophic successor, Sir Thomas More. If we are to believe the articles of impeachment, Wolsey's private character was not immaculate, and his celibacy was only in name. He was so absorbed in foreign politics, that affairs at home became only of secondary interest to him. The Reformation which he coveted, or which would have been sanctioned by Sir Thomas More, his friends, and his coadjutors, would have been superficial at best—the sewing of a piece of new cloth on the old garment.

Barnes, on his recantation, had been sent to the Fleet, but was afterwards made a prisoner at large in the Augustine Monastery in London, and in this retreat he carried on the forbidden work of trafficking in New Testaments—was a resetter and seller of this perilous contraband. Thus John Tyball of Steeple Bumstead, to whom previous allusion has been made, deponed on April 28th, 1528, "That at Mychaelmasse last past was twelve monethe this respondent and Thomas Hilles came to London to Frear Barons, then being at the Freers Augustines (Austin Friars) in London, to buy a New Testament in English. . . . That the sayd Thomas Hilles and this respondent shewyd the Freer Barons of certayne old bookes that they had; as of four Evangelists, and certayne epistles of Peter and Poule in Englishe (that is of the Wycliffite version). Which bookes the sayd Frear dyd little regard, and made a twyte of it, and sayd, a poynt for them, for they be not to be regarded toward the new printed Testament in Englishe; for it is of more cleaner Englishe. And then the sayd Frear Barons delyvered to them the sayd New Testament in Englishe; for which they payd three shillings and two pence, and desyred them, that they wold kepe it close. And after the delyverance of the sayd New Testament to them, the Frear Barons dyd lyken the New Testament in Latin to a cymball tynnklyng and brasse sownd-

yng," expressions in perfect keeping with his usual style of speech.¹

Portions of Necton's confession reveal the ingenuity and resolution of the "New Testamenters." He deponed that "he sold fyve of the said New Testaments to Sir William Furboshare, synging man, in Stowmarket, in Suffolk, for seven or eight grotes a pece. Also, two of the same New Testaments in Bury St. Edmonds; that is to say, to Raynold Wodelesse, one; and Thomas Horfan, another, for the same price.

"Furthermore, Vicar Constantine, at dyvers tymes, had of this respondent about fifteen or sixteen of the New Testaments of the biggest. And this respondent saith, that the sayd Vicar Constantine dyvers tymes bowght of him certayne of the sayd New Testaments. Also, he sold Sir Richard Bayfell two New Testaments unbound, about Cristmas last; for the which he paid three shillings and four pence. . . . That he sold five or six of the said New Testaments to diverse persons of the cite of London, whose namys or dwellyng places he doth not remember. . . . That since Easter last, he bowght of Geffray (Lolme) Usher of Saynt Antonyes, with whom he hath byn aqueynted by the space of an yere, or thereabout (by reason he was Mr. Forman, the person of Hony Lane his servant, and for that this respondent did moche resort to the said persons sermons) eighteen New Testaments in English of the smal volume. . . . That about Cristmas last, there came a Duche man, beyng now in the Flete, which wold have sold this respondent two or three hundreth of the said New Testaments in English, which this respondent did not buy; but sent him to Mr. Fyshe to buy them; and said to the Duche man, 'Looke what Mr. Fyshe doth, I wil do the same.'² Of course, many persons engaged in the work of distribution, managed to keep themselves out of sight and escaped detection, as they moved in secret "paths which the vulture's eye had not seen."

Simon Fyshe, of Gray's Inn, and George Harman, of Antwerp, had a busy hand in the labour. The former of

¹ Strype's Memorials, pt. II, p. 54. ² Strype's Memorials, pt. II, p. 63.

these zealous men had issued a tract, called "the Supplication of the Beggars,"¹ addressed to the king. It was a small tract of eight pages, and was given to his Majesty, and scattered on Candlemas day through the streets; and its burden was a disclosure of the reasons "why the Monks and Friars, Pardoners and Sumners, will not let the New Testament go abroad in your mother-tongue." The excitement was growing, and the enemies and friends of an English translation were fast fronting each other, and taking up a decided position. But the wood was yet growing green in the fields that was again to supply faggots for the fires of Smithfield.

¹ The year is uncertain, but it was issued in the earlier portion More's reply, the "Supplication of that year, as the Tract of Fyshe of Souls," was written before he is said to have been published "of was Lord Chancellor, or before *late*." October, 1529; perhaps, therefore,

CHAPTER XI.

AS the importation of the New Testament was a clandestine and dangerous traffic, there is no distinct record of it. The common people received it gladly; but it encountered fierce opposition from men in authority, clergy, statesmen, lawyers, and scholars. It was deemed an exponent and defence of Lutheranism, and, therefore, was spurned away. Many were scared out of their reason by it, as if there had lighted among them a shell charged with explosive missiles. We cannot tell in what way the authorities were first made aware of the audacious presence of the Book in the midst of them; but the distribution could not be long hidden from the keen and sharp eyes of suspicious ecclesiastics. Our only information on the point is from the "railing rhymes" of Friar Roye, with whom the translator had been so displeased. The satire reveals that Standish, Bishop of St. Asaph's,¹ who "played the part of Judas," was the first who brought the report to Wolsey, "the man in the redde cappe," who spake the words of Pilate and answered that he found "no fault" therein. Tunstall (Caiaphas) and the other bishops overruled the Cardinal to an adverse decision, so that he gave judgment against the hated translation, and ordered that it should be burned wherever it was found. This reluctance ascribed to Wolsey may apparently be believed. The forty-third article in the long list of charges presented against him at his fall, alleges that the said Lord Cardinal hath been the "impeacher and

¹ The name of his diocese was Græculus'iste, calls him episcopus often contracted into St. Asse; and a sancto Asino. Erasmus, whom he stigmatized as

disturber of due and direct correction of heresies." When Lutheran opinions had been growing at Cambridge, and a visitation of the University was demanded in 1523 by some of the bishops, Wolsey expressly inhibited it, though Bishop Longland who was the king's confessor, had urged him to a decided prosecution of "heretics and destruction of Lutheran books." When he had selected for his magnificent foundation of Christ Church a few students from Cambridge, he did not cancel their appointment, though some of them were suspected of Lutheran leanings. When Latimer was brought before him at York House, and had given an account of a sermon which had offended the Bishop of Ely, Wolsey said to him, "You shall have my license, and shall preach it unto his beard let him say what he will." Wolsey's license sufficed for all England. To the king's chagrin, he openly disagreed with many parts of his book against Luther—the book that gained him the title of Defender of the Faith. He had refused to act on a papal bull of June 19, 1520, because he had no power to burn Lutheran books; and the Pope, in reply, told him, that not the books but the authors should be burned. For his great educational deeds and designs, he had suppressed forty-two religious houses. Indeed, he had contrived to gather in to himself, against all law, extraordinary revenues. For not only was he Archbishop of York, in succession to Cardinal Bainbridge; but the "king-cardinal" drew at the same time the incomes of the dioceses of Durham and Winchester, farmed the bishoprics of Bath, Worcester, and Hereford, and held the Abbey of St. Alban's *in commendam*. He had also an annuity from the French king of 12,000 livres, and from the Pope and the Emperor a yearly pension of 7,500 ducats. The first began to be paid him in 1518, and the second in 1526. "Unsatisfied in getting which was a sin, yet in bestowing he was most princely." In obtaining academic funds from the dissolution of religious houses, Wolsey had been preceded by Chichele and Waynflete. But his arrogance had grown apace. Giustiniani, the Venetian ambassador, records,¹ that when he came to England, Wolsey was accustomed to

¹ Despatches, vol. II, p. 314.

say, "The king will do so and so;" afterwards his words were, "We will do so and so;" and finally, "I shall do so and so."

Tunstall, soon after the consultation referred to, preached at St. Paul's, and denounced the New Testament as containing two thousand errors;¹ Tyndale's simple reply being, "They have now so narrowly looked on my translation, that there is not so much as one i therein, if it lack a tittle over his head, but they have noted it, and numbered it unto the ignorant people for an heresy." The volume so denounced was then publicly thrown into the fire, and the burning of it was known at Rome by the 21st of November. At that date Cardinal Campeggio wrote to Wolsey a letter of congratulation: "We lately heard, to his Majesty's great praise and glory, that he had most justly caused to be burned a copy of the Holy Bible which had been mistranslated into the common tongue. . . . Assuredly, no burnt offering could be more pleasing to Almighty God."² On Wednesday, 24th October, Tunstall, "by the duty of our pastoral office," issued a prohibition, a copy of which was sent to the four Archdeacons of Middlesex, Essex, Colchester, and London. The prohibition somewhat bluntly aims at "many children of iniquity, maintainers of Luther's sect, that have craftily translated the New Testament into our English tongue . . . of which translation there are many books imprinted, some with glosses, and some without, containing in the English tongue that most deadly and most pernicious poison dispersed through all our diocese of London in great numbers."³ Within thirty days these books were to be delivered up to his vicar-general, Geoffrey Wharton, under penalty of excommunication and incurring the suspicion of heresy. Eleven days afterwards, on the 3rd November, Archbishop Warham issued a mandate, in similar terms, to

¹ Lambert, who was burned in 1538, in reply to the twenty-sixth article of his indictment, which questioned him about "scriptures in the mother language," says, among other things, that he heard Tunstall's sermon "on the 'hideous errors' in it that I, and not only I, but likewise many others, think verily to be none." Foxe, vol. V, p. 213.
² Cotton MSS., Vitellius, B. viii, 164.
³ Foxe, vol. IV, p. 666.

Voysey, Bishop of Exeter, the document being meant for his entire province.¹ The translator was at this time unknown, for the version was published anonymously; but early next year Tyndale's connection with it was no secret, as may be seen in Ridley's letter, on page 126. Warham also bought up a good many copies of both editions at an expense of nearly a thousand pounds sterling; and doubtless such copies were speedily and effectually destroyed. To defray the cost of these large purchases, the Primate sent a circular to his suffragans, asking pecuniary contributions. Bishop Nikke² of Norwich, in reply, promises, in a letter of 14th June, 1527, to send ten marks, about £100 in present currency, and nearly a tenth part of the whole outlay. Some of the blind old bishop's words may be quoted: "In right humble manner I commend me unto your good lordship, doing the same to understand that I lately received your letters, dated, at your manor of Lambeth, the 26th day of the month of May, by which I do perceive that your Grace hath lately gotten into your hands all the books of the New Testament translated into English and printed beyond the sea,—as well those with the glosses joined unto them as the other without the glosses . . . Surely, in mine opinion, you have done them a gracious and blessed deed, and God, I doubt not, shall highly reward you therefor . . .—your humble obediencer and bondsman."³

The circulation of such a novelty as an English New Testament created a demand, and that demand was speedily supplied. The press which Tyndale himself had employed was at rest, but the work was done by other printers. By the end of 1526 a third edition of the New Testament, in small volume, was issued at Antwerp by Christopher of Endhoven, who was arrested in consequence of his adventure. There had been, in 1527, an alarming scarcity of corn in England "on account of the great rain which fell in the sowing-time," and in the crisis "the gentle merchants of the Stilyard" brought in provisions from abroad, "so that wheat was better

¹ Wilkin's *Concilia*, vol. III, p. 706.

² Cotton MSS., Vitellius, B. ix, fol.

³ Often, or usually, spelled Nix. 117, b., British Museum.

cheap in the capital than in England all over."¹ But as there was another and contemporaneous famine in the land, those vessels carried also a more precious cargo than "the bread which perisheth."

About the end of 1527, or beginning of 1528, the agency by which the circulation had been so successfully carried out was at last detected. Bilney had been examined at the end of the year, and probably hints incautiously dropped by some witnesses during the trial may have led to the discovery. Arrests were made in London. The University of Oxford was searched and Wolsey's own college, St. Frideswide's or Cardinal College, was found to be deeply infected. Several students escaped, and others were incarcerated in a deep cell under the college, used for storing salt fish, and some of them died from the effects of this unhealthy imprisonment and food. Nor was Bishop Tunstall idle after his return from Spain, and many people guilty of possessing an English Bible were carried before him. "Old Father Hacket, being hard set upon, made a discovery of a great many of his friends and followers," to the number of forty, who "dwelt chiefly in London;"² and other criminated persons, being entangled in the queries put to them, gave information in spite of themselves. Another class in terror revealed everything, and at once brought friends and relatives into immediate peril. Sebastian Harris, curate of the parish church of Kensington, was brought up, and confessed that "he had the New Testament in the vulgar tongue, translated by William Hochen, priest, and friar Roye." He was sentenced not to approach the city for four years nearer than two miles. Rodolph Bradford, fellow of King's College, Cambridge, carried New Testaments to Reading, "with a godly desire to disperse them," and he was afterwards imprisoned for two years as the penalty of his work.³ Forman, rector of All Hallows, Honey Lane (Garret being his curate), and Jeffray Lolme, usher in St. Anthony's School, were trusted and successful agents in the secret and dangerous toil of sowing the divine seed—"the word of God."

¹ Halle's *Chronicle*, p. 736, London, 1809.

² Strype, vol. I, pt. 1, p. 114.

³ He died chaplain to Bishop Latimer.

Numerous persons were taken up for having, selling, or reading the printed English Testament. Tunstall and Wharton his vicar-general, with their spies, had been very dexterous and successful, and the bishop wrote on the 15th March, 1528, to Wolsey, that he was obliged to commit a man to the Fleet, as his own prisons were so full.

But, as the New Testaments came from abroad, it was deemed advisable not only to check the torrent, but to arrest it at its source. Royal letters were accordingly sent to the Princess Margaret, the Emperor's representative in the Low Countries, to the Governor of the "English House" at Antwerp, and to Hacket also, the English envoy, urging and empowering him to get possession of the books. He came at once from Mechlin to Antwerp to do the work; but the task was one of great difficulty. He was "forward in the business, made no small diligence; . . . it is very necessary and time to be done, before the end of this Barrow¹ market. But the first beginning and execution must be done in the town of Antwerp, which is the fountain of such things, and herewith all other places will take an example. And if it has happened that your Grace had not received some other books of the translation, as I have sent you here before now, at all adventures, I send you this inclosed, one of such like as has been imprinted in the said town of Antwerp; of the which be arrested, in the Justice's hands nigh a three hundred abiding sentence."² Hacket's first demand was "that the imprimer of the said book, named Christopher of Endhoven, ought to be banished out of all the Emperor's lands and countries, and that the third part of all his goods should be confiscated in the Emperor's hands, and all the foresaid English books burnt in the fire, according to the Emperor's last mandment upon such like heresies." But the Lords of Antwerp, bound by their own laws and usages, would not interfere to inflict such a punishment, and Endhoven was released. Hacket next proposed to buy up the whole stock

¹ Bergen-op-Zoom.

4th January, 1527, Cotton MSS.,

² Letter from Mechlin to Brian Galba, B. ix, fol. 37. Tuke, one of the king's secretaries,

of volumes, and despatch it to England, as those in possession of Endhoven could not be touched by law; but all that could be found in Antwerp or Barrow were collected and burned, as he informs Wolsey on the 20th of February, 1520—"three books" being specially referred to—and these are plainly three editions of Tyndale, copies of which had been sent to him from England for identification.

That there was an eager and incessant demand in England for the New Testament came to be well known, and the demand stimulated a growing supply, in spite of the hazards attending such merchandize. During Endhoven's arrest, as the envoy had hinted, an additional issue of the New Testament, "in a greater letter," was brought out by another printer in Antwerp, and copies of both editions were imported in the corn ships. Thus, in 1528, John Ruremond, a Dutchman, was abjured for "causing fifteen hundred of Tyndale's New Testament to be printed in Antwerp, and for bringing five hundred of them into England." According to George Joye, of both editions five thousand copies were printed; but the last edition had "no corrector of the press." Hacket writes in alarm to Wolsey, on the 23rd of May, "Some new printers of the town of Antwerp have brought to be sold to this Barrow market diverse English books, entitled the New Testament, . . . of which I have found twenty-four in one man's hand. . . . I trust shortly to see them burned. . . . I hear say that there has been at the last Frankfort market more than two thousand such like English books." The Envoy in his zeal had also visited Ghent, Bruges, Brussels, and Louvain, and did what he could to collect and send to the fire the copies prepared for his native island. At length, as a more effectual remedy, it was resolved not only to watch and stop the presses on the Continent, but, if possible, to capture the translator himself, and his associates. Wolsey, in June, 1528, corresponded on the subject with Hacket, and asked that means should be taken to have five men (three¹ of them

¹ The three men were apparently ander Barclay, the translator and en-Roye, Tyndale, and Harman. Rinck's larger of Brandt's Navis Stultifera letter to Wolsey mentions also Alex— the Ship of Fools.

especially) arrested, and that the Lady Mary, the regent, should be induced to send them to England for trial. The scheme failed; the law of the empire allowed the extradition of a traitor, but not of a heretic. Search, however, was made for the delinquents, and Harman only could be found. On the 14th of July, Hacket notified Wolsey of Harman's apprehension. It was a bold stroke on the part of a foreign power to imprison an English merchant. The petition of Harman for release in July, 1528, tells his story:—"Richard Harman, being in prison for having sold New Testaments to English merchants, having been sent to him out of Germany, does plead for himself, that he and his wife might be let out on sufficient bail, to recover his debts upon the breaking up of the fair." But he was not released till the 26th February, 1529. In the meantime, Wolsey was not to be baffled, and letters came from England charging Harman with treason; but the Princess and Council wished to know the special treason before they would act. Hacket hoped that Harman's "purse would suffer long penance," but he was soon alarmed at the report of Harman's declaration that his imprisonment had cost him 2,000 guilders, and that he confidently trusted to recover damages. Time passed on, and Harman, getting out of prison, had Hacket arrested by the Amant; but his privilege as ambassador was successfully pleaded, and he was allowed to depart to Brussels, and thus was happily out of Antwerp before Tyndale came to reside in it. Wolsey did not like to be defeated; Friar West of Greenwich was taken into the plot; and a special appeal, dated Hampton Court Palace, on the 5th of August, was made to Herman Rinck of Cologne. Rinck's answer, October, 1528, shows the sort of work expected of him, and he had pride and pleasure in doing it, his reply being: "With the utmost diligence I shall also take care as to the aforesaid Roye and Hutchin, . . . both as to apprehending them and observing what places they frequent." He had already said that they had not been seen at Frankfort since Easter, and the market after Lent, and it is not known whither they are gone, or whether they are alive or dead." But Tyndale's place of abode could not be discovered, for

he had left Worms and gone to Marburg. Rinck, however, adds that his industry had been to some extent rewarded: "I gained over the consuls at Frankfort by gifts and presents, so that I might scrape together and heap together . . . all the books from every quarter. But these books (unless I had found them out and interposed) would have been inclosed and concealed in paper, packed in ten bundles covered over with flax (or linen); they would in time, craftily and without suspicion, have been transmitted by sea into Scotland and England as to the same place, and would have been sold as merely clean paper; but I think that very few or none of those carried away have been discovered."¹ Scott, the printer of Strasburg, was arrested also; but the book which he had published was Roye's Satire, with which Tyndale had no connection. The clever satirist had, with the plausibility which Tyndale ascribes to him, talked the printer over to execute the work, though he had no funds to defray the expense.

At the Treaty of Cambray in 1529, when Tunstall, More, and Hacket were the English representatives, it was agreed that while mercantile traffic between the Low Countries and England was to continue, "no one was to print or sell any Lutheran books on either side." Tunstall came home by way of Antwerp, and his exploit there has been recorded by Halle, the old Chronicler: "Here it is to be remembered one Augustine Packington, a merchant and mercer of London, the same time was in Antwerp, where the bishop then was; and this Packington was a man who highly favoured Tyndale, but to the bishop shewed the contrary. The bishop, desirous to have his purpose brought to pass, communed of the New Testaments, and how gladly he would buy them. Packington, hearing him say so, said—'My Lord, if it be your pleasure, I can in this matter do more, I dare say, than most of the merchants of England that are here, for I know the Dutchmen and strangers that have bought them of Tyndale, and have them here to sell; so that if it be your lordship's pleasure to pay for

¹ Cotton MSS., Vitellius, B. xxi, fol. 43, British Museum.

them, for otherwise I cannot come by them, but I must disburse money for them, I will then assure you to have every book of them that is here imprinted, and is here unsold.' The bishop, thinking he had God by the toe, when indeed he had, as after he thought, the devil by the fist, said, 'Gentle Mr. Packington, do your diligence and get them; and with all my heart I will pay for them whatsoever they cost you, for the books are erroneous and nought, and I intend surely to destroy them all, and to burn them at Paul's Cross.' Augustine Packington came to William Tyndale and said, 'William, I know that thou art a poor man, and hast a heap of New Testaments and books by thee, for the which thou hast endangered thy friends and beggared thyself; and I have now gotten thee a merchant, which with ready money shall despatch thee of all that thou hast, if you think it profitable to yourself.' 'Who is the merchant?' said Tyndale. 'The Bishop of London,' said Packington. 'O, that is because he will burn them,' said Tyndale. 'Yea, marry,' quoth Packington. 'I am the gladder,' quoth Tyndale, 'for these two benefits shall come thereof—I shall get money to bring myself out of debt, and the whole world will cry out against the burning of God's Word; and the overplus of the money that shall remain with me shall make me more studious to correct the said New Testament, and so newly to imprint the same once again, and I trust the second will much better like you than ever did the first.' So forward went the bargain, the bishop had the books, Packington had the thanks, and Tyndale had the money.¹ The sequel of the story is as amusing: "After this Tyndale corrected the same New Testaments again, and caused them to be newly imprinted, so that they came thick and threefold over into England. . . . The bishop sent for Packington again, and asked how the Testaments were still so abundant, and Packington replied, 'It will never be better so long as they have the letters and the stamps. Therefore it were better for your lordship to buy the stamps too.' In short space after, it fortun'd that George Constantine was apprehended by Sir Thomas More, who was then Chancellor

¹ The story is also told in Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, vol. IV, p. 670.

of England, suspected of certain heresies. During the time that he was in the custody of Master More, after divers communications, amongst other things Master More asked of him, saying, 'Constantine,¹ I would have thee to be plain with me in one thing that I will ask, and I promise thee I will show thee favour in all other things whereof thou art accused. There is beyond the sea, Tyndale, Joye, and a great many of you; I know they cannot live without help. There are some that help and succour them with money; and thou being one of them, hadst thy part thereof, and therefore knowest from whence it came. I pray thee, tell me who be they that help them thus?' 'My lord,' quoth Constantine, 'I will tell thee truly; it is the Bishop of London that hath holpen us, for he hath bestowed among us a great deal of money, upon New Testaments, to burn them; and that hath been, and yet is, our only succour and comfort.' 'Now, by my troth,' quoth More, 'I think even the same, for so much I told the bishop before he went about it.'² The story is no doubt true in its essential features; but the implied simplicity of Tunstall can scarcely be accepted. Nor was the poverty of Tyndale so great as the anecdote supposes. He was poor in that he had no settled income, but his own personal expenditure was small, and he never wanted money for his work. Some kind friends must have invested large funds in his first enterprise. The six thousand copies of the two first editions of the New Testament

¹ In 1531, Constantine not only failed in courage before Sir Thomas More, but, in More's own words, "uttered and disclosed divers of his companions, . . . devised how these devilish books which himself and others of his fellows had bought and shipped, might come to the bishop's hands to be burnt. And, therefore, he showed me the shipman's name that had them, and the marks of the fardels by which I have since his escape received them."

² Halle's *Chronicle*, p. 762. London, 1809. A brother of Packington, and one of the burgesses in Parliament for the city of London, as he was going out on a foggy morning to a neighbouring church to attend early service, was shot dead in the street. Incent, Dean of St. Paul's, confessed on his death-bed that he had "hired an Italian for sixty crowns or thereabouts to do the feat." Foxe, vol. V

p. 250.

More's Works, p. 347, ed. 1557.

printed by him were sold for about two shillings a piece,¹ and must therefore have cost about six hundred pounds, representing nine thousand pound in present value. In Antwerp, at a later period, he went about bestowing charities on the poor and sick.

More was evidently perplexed to account for the great expense incurred in bringing so many New Testaments into the country, and in supporting abroad "a few ungracious folks that fled out of the realm . . . that nought had here and nought carried hence, and are yet sustained and supported with money. . . . Which books, albeit that they can neither be printed there without great cost, nor here sold without great adventure and peril, yet cease they not to print there, and send them hither by whole vats full at once. And in some places, looking for no price, cast them abroad by night; labour, travel cost, charge, and peril involved."² But he could not forbear a sneering allusion to such books, "of every sort of them, some be brought into this realme, and kept in hucker-mucker, by some shrewd masters, that kepe them for no good."³ The Lord Chancellor did not realize the priceless value which many good people put upon the Gospels and Epistles in their native tongue, and he might have known that to many brave and enthusiastic spirits there was a strange fascination in the very peril involved in a work which, pure and blessed as it was, might load their limbs with iron, or send them to the stake. The first two editions had long since gone to England, and the books bought for the fire must have been the Dutch reprints. There is some probability that Tyndale about this period saw an edition through the press without revising it, but he seems to have put into it the epilogue to the Epistle to the Romans, which had been published separately, and to have sent copies to his younger

¹ Hilles deponed that he had sold a Testament for three shillings. demn me hugger-mugger." Letters 231, Parker ed. Hamlet, act 4,

² Preface to Confutation. scene 5. See Wheatley's Dictionary of Reduplicated Words, *sub voce*,

³ Hucker-mucker means clandestinely or in secret. Thus Philpot says—"I fear they will con-

brother John in London. Bayfield, whom Stokesley at his trial knocked down with his crozier, and who was ultimately burned at Newgate, was accused of having a copy of the New Testament containing a prologue to the Romans, and such a prologue does not seem to characterize the earlier Antwerp issues.

After Wolsey had bidden "a long farewell to all his greatness," and had been succeeded by Sir Thomas More, a fierce proclamation was issued at the end of the year 1529, by royal authority, against all heretical teachers, and against importers, sellers, authors, possessors, and distributors of heretical books. Among the twenty-four books mentioned, Tyndale's New Testament occupies the first place, a preeminence to which it was entitled for its own sake, though the terror of its enemies lifted it to such honour. All are invited to become spies, and give information. The ecclesiastics only had interfered up to this time; now the bishops and the civil authorities were allied as inquisitors.

But the printing of the New Testament was still going on as a matter of common trade; Jewish capital had been invested in it; sale and export were now matters of commercial calculation and profit, so that, apart from Tyndale's personal cognizance and supervision, three editions probably were printed at Antwerp in 1529 and 1530. The circulation of these Scriptures, in spite of all opposition, was widening in England, and Bishop Nikke, who had given so liberally for buying up copies at an earlier period, complained, in 1530, that the suppression of them was beyond his ability, and the confession was wrung from him, "it passeth my power, or any spiritual man, now to do it," one reason alleged by him being "that the people believe it to be the king's pleasure that the New Testament in English should go forth, and that men should have it and read it." He goes on to utter the melancholy misgiving, if "they," the readers of the New Testament in English, "continue any time, they shall undo us all. . . . I hear of no clerk that hath come out lately of that College (Gonville and Caius), but savoureth of the frying

pan,¹ though he speak never so holily."² The phrase first employed in one clause of the doleful letter had been "the saide boks," but it was erased and the more special words inserted, "the New Testamente in inglesshe," for it, the record of Love Incarnate, was the real object of dread and hostility. The same year, on the 24th May, the more important members of the hierarchy met—Warham, Tunstall, and Gardynere—with Sir Thomas More, and "with the king's highness being present," and issued another condemnation of the New Testament "corrupted by William Tyndale," and ordered that it was to be "repelled, rejected, and put away." This meeting was called by the king on account of the pressure of public opinion, since divers and many of his subjects were "thinking that it were to all men not only expedient, but also necessary, to have in the English tongue both the New Testament and the Old"; but the decision was that "it is not necessary for the said Scripture to be in the English tongue, and in the hands of the common people." Yet popular desire, as it could not be repressed, was humoured, for it was proclaimed that "his Highness intended to provide, that the Holy Scriptures shall be by great, learned, and catholic persons translated into the English tongue, if it shall then seem to his Grace convenient to be."

About the same period, Tunstall, now Bishop of Durham, fulfilling the threatening which he had uttered at Antwerp, openly burned all the New Testaments which he had bought or seized, in St. Paul's Churchyard,³ Stokesley being then in Italy. This fire was meant as a public demonstration and warning; but, as Burnet remarks, the people called it "a burning of the Word of God." The destruction at this time, as well as before and after it, must have been great. As we have already said, of the quarto edition only a fragment

¹ The cant term seems to have been a common one. West, Bishop of Ely, thus menaced Latimer on his change of view, "I perceive that you smell somewhat of the pan." Coverdale speaks of "the Pelagian's

pan." Works, p. 387, Parker Society edition.

² Cotton MSS., Cleopatra E. V., fol. 360.

³ Halle's Chronicle, p. 771.

remains; of the octavo, two copies, one of them imperfect, survive; and of the other three editions printed at Antwerp, one by Endhoven, and two by Ruremond, not a single specimen has been distinctly identified. But the people had now some fuller understanding of the character and worth of an English version; what had been valued by a few, had come to be appreciated by multitudes. The rabid destruction of the Scriptures only raised suspicions against the clerical burners, and diffused an intense desire to possess a book at the circulation and study of which the spirituality were so greatly alarmed. Prohibitions against possessing and reading the New Testament were not obeyed in many cases. In 1529, Mafelde, precentor of the Benedictine Friars at Rochester, was proceeded against for keeping an English Testament, contrary to the injunctions

Proclamations and burnings were a coarse and vulgar expedient for the suppression of a book which claimed a reception as an honest and learned effort to give the Scriptures in an intelligible form to the English nation. To destroy the volume was only a rough way of checking its circulation by putting it out of existence. But, as the producing power was not injured, and copies could still be rapidly multiplied, and secretly imported and sent through the country, something better than the application of fire was thought of, and a critical condemnation of the version was resorted to. Tunstall had already declared that there were more than two thousand errors in the volume. Ridley,¹ in a letter, of which use has been made more than once, had also taken the same ground—reprobating the doctrine of the "Notes," finding fault with a few renderings, branding the omission of such terms as charity, penance, priest, and church, and adding, "Show ye the people that if any be of so proud and stubborn stomach, that he will believe that there is no fault or error except it be declared to him that he may see it, let him come hither to my lord, who hath profoundly examined all, and he shall hear and see errors, except that he be blind and have no

¹ Ridley was uncle to the famous martyr of the same name, and de- frayed the expense of his educa- tion.

eyes.”¹ Tunstall's copy must have borne these numerous marks on its margin. But statements of this nature were too vague to make any impression, and they were doubtless ascribed to ecclesiastical prejudice and intolerance. At the same time the man who pronounces these last censures absolves himself from any intimate acquaintance with the condemned volume, when he coolly concludes: “I have none of these books, but only remember what things I read in the prefaces and annotations.” One sentence in this letter has a peculiar interest, as from it one might almost guess the title of the New Testament, for Ridley pronounces it heretical since it says “that it is prent as it was written by the Evangelistes” . . . ; and the title page of Joye's wretched revision is somewhat similar.

¹ Cotton MSS., Cleopatra, E. V, p. 362.

CHAPTER XII.

THE New Testament had therefore now to suffer the critical vituperation of Sir Thomas More. Any one acquainted with his classical tastes and acquirements, his love of erudition and of scholars, would have anticipated from him a hearty welcome for Tyndale's masterly production. Surely a befitting eulogy might have been expected from so proficient a Greek student who had greeted in an eloquent Latin epigram the appearance of the Original Text of Erasmus in 1516, and from so accomplished an English writer as the historian of Richard III; from one who could so well appreciate the correctness of the translation, and who, while he admired the boldness and novelty, could make all allowance for the difficulties, of a first undertaking. More was fond of theology; and in St. Lawrence Church, Old Jewry, he had in early life lectured with great popularity on Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*. Bishop Tunstall shrank himself from the task of attacking Tyndale, but laid it on the learned and eloquent statesman, then Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. As a preliminary step, he formally licensed him, on the 7th of March, 1528, to “read the works of the heretics,” in order that he might confute them, for “he could play the Demosthenes both in our native tongue and in Latin.” More, with wonderful speed, produced a volume in the form of a Dialogue¹ between the author

¹ A Dialogue of Sir Thomas diverse matters . . . with many More, knyghte, one of the Coun- other things touching the pestilent saill of our Soveraine Lorde the secte of Luther and Tyndale, by the King and chancellour of hys Duchy t'one bygone (begun) in Saxony, and of Lancaster, wherein be treatyd by the t'other labored to be brought

and a messenger that a friend had sent to consult him about current events, such as the recent burning of the New Testament. The Dialogue was published in June, 1529, and on the 25th October of the same year he became Lord Chancellor of England. In his ingenious and eloquent arguments on behalf of the Popish Church we are not here interested, nor with Tyndale's lucid and vigorous replies on these points. More, however, does not display that familiarity with patristic and mediæval learning which was possessed by many divines and scholars of his age. The Answer of Tyndale, put to press in 1531, was printed, according to Joye, at Amsterdam, under the supervision of Fryth. More was said to have "the best knack of any man in Europe at calling bad names in good Latin"; but his Latin occasionally suffers from the impetuosity of his invective.¹ Now, however, to produce popular impressions, he wrote against Tyndale in English.

More roundly declares that no man who knew the character of these New Testaments could complain of their being burned, their proper name being not "the New Testament, but Tyndale's Testament, for it had been corrupted and changed to a clean contrary thing." "Over a thousand texts by tale" had been wrongly and falsely translated, and it was so hopelessly bad that it could not be amended, for it was such a mass of errors that to study to find out one error were "to study where to find water in the sea." A new translation could alone suffice, "for it is as easy to weave a new web of cloth as to sew up every hole in a net." To one who had been obliged to leave his native land, that he might be a translator, and who had honestly given to the work, "to him very painful," all his erudition and so many laborious and solitary days, a charge so sweeping and merciless as that of Sir Thomas More must have been "as a sword in his bones," wounding his tenderest sensibilities. Who could bear to be told so bluntly, and taunted so haughtily, that

into England. Emprinted in Lon-¹ As in his Responsio ad Convicia don at the sygne of the Meremayd, M. Lutheri, 1523.
at Powlys gate, M^{CC}XXIX.

he had come so lamentably short of his great aim? Had his prayers and toils, his love of God's Word and its free circulation, been all for nought, and were they to end "in vanity and vexation of spirit"? Tyndale's soul was therefore stirred from its depths, and he answered not only with no small asperity and keen personal retort, but sometimes descended to employ terms unworthy of his high vocation. He had been for years away from all softening associations of kindred or friends, forlorn and isolated among strangers, while his opponent was living in lettered ease and affluence, endowed with high power, and riding in the "second chariot" after the king. More had led the Commons in their refusal of money to Henry VII, on the occasion of the marriage of his eldest daughter Margaret to James IV of Scotland, and had fallen under the royal displeasure so deeply, that, as his anticipated success in life seemed to be suddenly clouded he thought of leaving the country. He might have recalled his own bitter feelings, as he contemplated a foreign sojourn, and ascribed them in an intensified form to Tyndale who had been expatriated for so many lonely years. His reply to More is always shrewd, straightforward, scholarly, and without evasion, vigorously and with success defending every point on which his version is assaulted.

More's enormous charge so vehemently made, dwindles at length into the alleged mistranslation of some six words—congregation, elder, love, favour, knowledge, repentance, instead of church, priest, charity, grace, confession, penance. Three of these terms—priest, charity, church—are specially referred to, "and every one of them is more than thrice three times repeated and rehearsed in the book." Tyndale easily gives good reason for some of these changes, because the older terms carried wrong associations with them. Seniors was not, however, a happy rendering, and Tyndale at once allows it—"it is no very good English. Howbeit, I spied my fault at once, long ere Master More told it me, and have mended it in all the works which I since made, and called it an 'elder.'" His defence of the rendering "love" is, "Verily charity is no known English in that sense which Agape

requireth." This rendering "love" was adduced, during a debate in the Scottish Parliament of 1543, as an objection to the free circulation of Scripture. It may be added, as to the word "congregation," that More's friend, Erasmus, in his Latin version, uses congregatio a great many times—as in Acts ii, 47; v, 11; vii, 38; xi, 26; xv, 22; Rom. xvi, 5; 1 Cor. i, 1; xiv, 4, 33; Coloss. iv, 16, &c., the Vulgate having ecclesia in all these places. At the same time More had certainly the right to ask Tyndale why on his avowed principles he had not also changed "bishop" into overseer, and "deacon" into servant, and "baptism" into washing—"as when a woman washes a buck of clothes." The Anglo-Saxon Version had used native terms in such places. More justly finds fault with the rendering of John i, 1, Tyndale's version being "In the beginning was that worde, and that word was with God, and God was that word," the scholarly Chancellor remarking that "the Greek article should have its proper sense, and that the *subjectum* and *prædicatum* in the last clause should be carefully distinguished."

The two men did not understand one another. More had no conception of the learning, the loyalty, the simple-heartedness, and self-denial of Tyndale; and if Tyndale had known More's uprightness and grandeur of character, he would never have suspected him of writing for lucre, or for "mere favour of the Church of Rome." The rumour ran that five thousand pounds were raised as a reward, and that when Tunstall and other bishops went to present the purse, More, with many thanks, declined to receive it, and, with all their importunity, they could not "fist him with a penny of it." His children were mentioned; but his reply was, "Not so; I should rather see it all in the Thames than I or mine should have the worth of one penny thereof." More's own account is, "I had not a grey groat given me since I wrote my Dialogues . . . in good faith, I will not say nay, but that, in reward of my goodwill and my labour against these heretics, some good and honourable men of the clergy have given me much more than ever I did or could deserve. But I dare take God and them also to record, that I did not take one penny

thereof, but as I plainly told them, I would rather have cast their money into the Thames than take it."¹ Tyndale had a strange and unfounded notion that the retirement of Wolsey and the elevation of More were only a little dramatic scene, without any reality—a change got up to please the people offended by the Cardinal, and, the end being served, the actors would return to their former position.

Sir Thomas More was a man of great breadth of intellect and of high mental culture; yet, when the Church was in question, his geniality of nature forsook him, "an evil spirit troubled him," and he could act and write in a style of gross and vulgar fanaticism. He was truly an anomaly. He had been all but seduced into the "idle celibacy" of the Charterhouse; but his intimacy with Colet and other friends saved him from such a fate, and he became with them a reformer. Yet this man, of proverbial humour and hilarity, wore a hair shirt² next his skin, and flagellated himself with a whip of knotted cords, "especially every Fridai and great Saints eves, and the fouer tymes of Ember Weeke." His dwelling was the abode of peace; his loving nature filled it with sunshine. It was not merely, according to Erasmus, like "the Academy of Plato," it was "a school of the Christian religion." More was fond of showing the animal pets of his children; and in Holbein's charming picture of his household, the monkey³ is seen lying in the folds of Dame Alice's⁴ dress, and the domestic fool also appears in the group. But with all this overflowing kindness of nature, he could say of poor men as honest as himself, "that there should have been more burned by a great many than there have been within the seven years last past, the lack whereof, I fear me, will make more to be burned within this seven year next coming." He main-

¹Apology, Works, p. 867, ed. 1557.

²The hair shirt, given by him to his daughter Margaret a short time before his execution, is said to be still preserved in the convent of Spilsburg, in the neighbourhood of Blandford.

³Erasmus had already immortalized the monkey, as he had seen it slyly and effectually defending a rabbit hutch from the attacks of a weasel.

⁴His second wife, whom, according to Erasmus, he styled *nec bella nec puella*.

tained in the case of Barnes, that he should have been burned, notwithstanding the king's safe-conduct; and in the case of Bilney, that the curt process should have been, Burn him to-day and try him to-morrow. The hands which had never been polluted by a bribe were, during his last months of office, stained with blood. Vindicating in his "Utopia," which apparently represents his own original beliefs, the doctrine of toleration—"for as man cannot make himself believe anything he pleases, no violence should be used to correct him"—he yet could have persons seized, scourged, and consumed to ashes, because of difference of religious opinions. He judged it, in his imaginary commonwealth, to be "foolish and indecent to threaten and terrify another for the purpose of making him believe what did not appear to him to be true," and he wished that "the world were all agreed to put all violence and compulsion away on all sides;" but he could go and see Bainham of the Middle Temple racked in the Tower—his crime being that he thought Tyndale's New Testament to be "utterly good," and the poor prisoner was at various times mercilessly whipped and tortured.¹ He had no difficulty in trying to force the conscience of other men; but rather than violate his own he willingly laid his head upon the block. All the while he was devoutly conscientious, and thought that he was doing God service in the repression of error, even to stripes and death; for, to any one who regards toleration as "soul-murder," the extirpation of heretics must be a paramount duty. His earlier theory was flung aside, and he sank, in some respects, to the level of his age. But he denies the story, afterwards told by Foxe and Burnet, that he had a tree in his garden called the Tree of Troth, to which he tied heretics that he might scourge them. He admits,

¹ Bainham had married the widow of Simon Fyshe, author of "The Supplication of Beggars," to which More had replied by, "The Supplication of Souls in Purgatory." In his address at the stake, 30th April, 1532, he said, "The articles I die for be

these—first, I say it is lawful for every man and woman to have God's Book in their mother tongue." . . . He called the Chancellor his "accuser and judge," and his last words were "The Lord forgive Sir Thomas More."

however, that he had ordered castigation to a young servant, who had been venting gross sacramentarian error taught him by George Joye, and that he had caused such things to be done by the officers of the Marshalsea to some classes of heretical offenders. He acknowledges, too, in his own piquant way, that heretics were very loath to fall into his hands, and he wonders at their reluctance, "for they were burnt none the sooner." In the administration of justice he was honest beyond suspicion, and laboured to conclude all actions within a reasonable period; nay, "the poorer and meaner the suppliant was, the more affably would he speak unto him, and the more heartily he would hearken to his cause and despatch him."¹ But not only did he administer the law against religious offenders with special zealousness, he also, as first judge under the crown, ordered or allowed the statutes against heretics to be so illegally stretched or disregarded, as to be the means of inflicting wanton outrage on helpless sufferers.² But lighter punishments were sometimes inflicted. When John Tyndale was arrested on the charge of corresponding with his brother, sending money to him, and receiving and selling the version, not only were he and Thomas Patmore, a London draper, very heavily fined, but the facetious Lord Chancellor of England sentenced them to be exhibited for a laughing-stock at the standard in Cheapside, on horseback with their faces to the animals' tails, and their cloaks garnished with copies of the forbidden Testament.³ He had composed a Latin poem

¹ Life by his great-grandson Cressacre More (p. 182), who, however, makes the mistake of calling his ancestor the first lay chancellor.

² The despatch sent to the English ambassador at Paris, giving an account of More's execution, uses language of vehement exaggeration to cover the weakness of its argument, "they were well worthy, if they had a thousand lives, to have suffered ten times a more terrible death."

³ This form of punishment might

not appear so singular in those days, for Lord Ellesmere, more than half a century afterwards, in the reign of James I, when a "Replication," extending to six score sheets, and which might have been contained in sixteen, was brought before him, ordered that the parchment should have a hole cut in the middle of it, and in this way be put over the head of the attorney who framed it, that it might hang over his shoulders with the written side outward, and

in high praise of the new sovereign, Henry VIII, on his accession; but he soon came to know the character of his royal master, for, speaking to his son-in-law Roper of the singular favour with which the king regarded him, he added, "Howbeit, son Roper, I may tell thee that I have no cause to be proud thereof; for if my head would win him a castle in France, it should not fail to go;" and it did go on the 6th of July, 1535.

He had enjoyed the witty and erudite conversation of Erasmus; and even when he held the Great Seal, he was so humble that he was wont to put on a surplice and sing among the choristers in his parish church of Chelsea. Yet his elevated and noble nature could stoop to use this language: "Our Saviour will say to Tyndale, Thou art accursed, Tyndale, the son of the devil, for neither flesh nor blood hath taught thee these heresies, but thine own father, the devil that is in hell." Or again, in another style: "Judge, Christian reader, whether it be possible that he be any better than a beast, out of whose brutish, beastly mouth cometh such a filthy foam of blasphemies against Christ's holy ceremonies." More had a profound admiration for Pico della Mirandola, whose Life he had translated, with portions of his Works, in 1510; and it would have been well if he had remembered one of the Italian prince's sayings, Englished by himself: "Take no heed what many men do, but do what thing the very law of nature, what thing very reason, what thing our Lord himself sheweth thee to be done." He eulogizes Savonarola as "a preacher, as well in cunning as in holiness of living most famous," even though he had been excommunicated by the Pope, and at length hanged and burned as a heretic; and might not he have allowed that others who opposed the Papacy were as honest and upright as the Florentine reformer? But, in his own words, "he had been troublesome to heretics," and, as he writes, in explanation of his self-made epitaph, to Erasmus, he had done it "with ambition."¹ More, however, stands in-

that he, so ornamented, should be led round the various courts of Westminster Hall.

¹ Quod in epitaphio profiteor, me hæreticis esse molestum, hoc ambitiose feci.

finately higher than some of his successors—than Audley, so obedient a minister in Henry's worst crimes; than Wriothesley, who, when Ann Askew was tortured, put his own hand to the rack to increase the lady's agony; or than Rich, whose "infamy" is chronicled by Lord Campbell.¹ In his preface to his Confutation, adverting stoically to various sufferers, he stigmatizes Hitton² as "a new saint of Tyndale canonization," but "the devil's stinking martyr," &c.; and when he refers to Tewksbury, a London tradesman, who had been arraigned before him in his own house at Chelsea, and sent by him and the Bishop of London to the fire, he declares that the martyr "owed all his heretical opinions to Tyndale's ungracious books, for which the poor wretch now lyeth in hell, and crieth out on him; and Tyndale, if he do not amend in time, he is like to find him, when they come together, a hot firebrand burning in his back. . . . The marvel is, Tyndale denieth purgatory except he intend to go to hell." Though his abuse of his opponents be so rabid, he contrives, like a clever lawyer, to fix on them a charge of railing: "To match them therein I neyther canne thoughte I woulde, neyther wyll I though I coulde, for in rayling standeth all their revel; with their railing all their roste meate is basted, all their potte seasoned, all their pye meate spiced, all their manchetes, and all their wafers, and all their ypocrase made."³ But, having washed his hands, and taken this protest, he could style Tyndale "one of the hellhounds which the devil hath in his kennel"—"a devilish drunken soul." Tyndale had called the writings of Aquinas "draff," and for this sin More describes him as "this drowsy drudge, who hath drunken so deep into the devil's dregs, that he may hap . . . to fall into the mashing fat, and turn himself

¹ Lives of the Chancellors, vol. II, p. 143. An interesting interpretation of the side glances in the Utopia, at things and customs in England, may be found in Brewer's Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII, vol. II, pt. 1, p. cclxvii, London, 1864.

² Apology, Works, p. 866, ed. 1557.

had been across the seas, and brought back two New Testaments. After trial he was sentenced to the stake by Archbishop Warham, and he was burned in February, 1529.

into draff, as the hogs shall feed upon and fill their bellies thereof." ¹

On the other hand, Tyndale falls as low as, with poor wit, to call Wolsey "Wolfslee"—"a wily wolf and a raging sea," and More "Master Mock"; and he sometimes approaches the Chancellor's rhetoric, as when he says of him, "Yet for all that, covetousness blinded the eyes of that gleering fox more and more, and hardened his heart against the truth with the confidence of his painted poetry, babbling eloquence, and juggling arguments of subtile sophistry, grounded on his 'unwritten verities,' as true and authentic as his story of Utopia." And he speaks of Popish ceremonies in a style so stark and naked that it must have shocked Catholics into antipathy and horror. Lord Herbert calls him a witty but violent, and sometimes railing disputant. ² But to Tyndale's honour be it recorded, that when he comes to the tenth chapter of the second book of More's Dialogue—a tale of very gross indecency—his single reply is, that "the chapter is meet for the author and his worshipful doctrine."

On the abstract question of translations of Scripture, Sir Thomas More writes calmly, like one who had looked up to Colet "with filial reverence," and admits that he would not deny it to the people, even though it might be abused. But the translation which he would allow must be a new one, made through a division of labour, by "sure, good, catholic, and well-learned men, and allowed by the ordinaries. It is not to be given to such as do not profit." Nor should the people have the entire Scripture; each, however, may secure a part at the selection of the bishop. But these notions, put forth in the Dialogue, are much narrowed in the Confutation and Apology; and he at length affirms that men may have all necessary knowledge, though the "corpse and body of the Scripture" be not translated into their mother tongue. He would not, however, object to a translation "if the men were amended, and the time meet therefor." When he declares that he knows of a version made before Wycliffe's

¹ Confutation, Works, p. 679.

² England under Henry VIII, p. 591, London, 1870.

time, ¹ Tyndale tartly replies, "What may not M. More say, by authority of his poetry? There is a lawful translation that no man knoweth, which is as much as no lawful translation." Why might not the bishops show which were that lawful translation, and let it be printed? Nay, if that had been obtained of them with large money, it had been printed, ye may be sure, long ere this. But, sir, answer me hereunto; how happeneth it that ye defenders translate not one yourselves, to cease the murmur of the people, and put to your own glosses, to prevent heretics? Ye would, no doubt, have done it long since, if ye could have made your glosses agree with the text in every place."

When More explained the relation of the bishops to versions of Scripture to be, not that the Scripture shall not be in English, but that no man may translate it by his own authority, or read it, until they had approved it, Tyndale answered, with suggestive brevity, "If no translation shall be had until they give license, or till they approve it, it shall never be had. And so it is all one, in effect, to say there shall be none at all in English." Tyndale was specially roused if any statement bore on his veracity—his character being still more precious to him than his literary and Biblical work. More had averred that Tyndale, on being "opposed of his doctrine ere he went over sea, said and sware that he meant no harm." Tyndale responds with deep solemnity and earnest abruptness, "He sware not; nor was there any man that required an oath of him."

More has a criticism of ferocious playfulness ² on Tyndale's English. He objects to the translation of John i, 21, "Art thou a prophet? And he answered, No." "Tyndale," says he, "by the Greek tongue, perceiving the article, saw well enough that he should not have translated it into the English,—Art

¹ See p. 61.

of which have been thus translated,—

² More had another friend of the same name to whom he had lent money, and whom the loan had alienated. He composed a few Latin lines on this debtor, the first

"O Tyndale, there was once a time,
a pleasant time of old,
Before thou cam'st a borrowing,
before I lent thee gold," &c.

thou a prophet? but, Art thou that prophet? to wit, the great prophet of whom Moses prophesied." And he adds, "I would here note by the way, that Tyndale here translateth *no* for *nay*, for it is a trifle and mistaking of the English word; saving that ye should see that he which in two so plain English words, and so common as is *nay* and *no*, cannot tell when he should take the tone, and when the tother, is not for translating into English a man very meet. For the use of these two words in answering to a question is this: Nay answereth the question framed in the affirmative, as, for example, if a man should ask Tyndale himself, Is an heretic meet to translate holy Scripture into English? So, to this question, if he will answer true English, he must answer *nay*, and not *no*. But if the question be asked him thus: Lo, is not an heretic meet to translate holy Scripture into English? To this question, lo, if he will answer true English, he must answer *no*. and not *nay*. And a like difference is there between these two adverbs, *yea* and *yes*. For if the question be framed unto Tyndale by the affirmative in this fashion: If an heretic falsely translate the New Testament into English, to make his false heresies seem the Word of God, be his book worthy to be burned? To this question, asked in this wise, if he will answer true English, he must answer *yea*, and not *yes*. But now, if the question be asked him thus by the negative: If an heretic falsely translate the New Testament into English, to make his false heresies seem the word of God, be not his books well worthy to be burned? To this question, in this fashion framed, if he will answer true English, he may not answer *yea*, but he must answer *yes*; and say, Yes, marry, be they, both the translation and the translator, and all that will hold with them."¹

Tyndale's reply to the "Dialogue" brought out, in 1532 More's "Confutation," which grew at length into five hundred folio pages. His "Apology" was written afterwards, in 1533, in which he attacked a book called the "Pacifier,"

¹ Works, p. 448, 1557. It is odd the first clause, explaining the difference that in the editions of More's Works 1532, and 1557, *nay* is printed *no* in

published by a lawyer, Christopher Saintgerman.¹ In it he reverts to the old subject of quarrel; and is obliged to admit that "men thought his 'Confutation' overlong, and therefore tedious to read," while they did not appreciate the point of his arguments, and did not like the sharp, bitter abuse which he had poured upon the translator. This was a sad confession on the part of a champion who had vowed, "I shall leave Tyndale never a dark corner to creep into, able to hide his head in." In fact, More's continuation of the controversy proves that he regarded his first efforts as unsuccessful. What man could do to write down the first English New Testament, he had done with a will; but the translation was not "wounded unto death." Joye's account of the various editions which had in the mean-time been poured into the country will be found on a subsequent page.

¹ More also published the "De- another work of Christopher Saint- bellation of Salem and Byzance," german. This gentleman's mother in reply to "Salem and Byzance," was named Anne Tyndale.

CHAPTER XIII.

TYNDALE'S whole nature was filled with his work, and overmastered by it. It was his meat, for he lived by it, and it was to him "the wine that maketh glad the heart of man." His mind was ever ruminating on it—dwelling on the benefits of it, or refuting the arguments usually paraded against it. The necessity of an English Bible was his dominant idea, which, like Aaron's rod, swallowed up every rival. After doing and daring so much for it himself, his counsel to Fryth, in 1532, was, "ever thrust in, that the Scriptures may be in the mother tongue, and learning set up in the universities."

This expression of an intense desire for the furtherance of sound learning was not peculiar to Tyndale—it had been always associated with intelligent plans of ecclesiastical reformation. Wycliffe's times bore witness to the truth of the statement in a very remarkable form. Even when his followers fell away, and were rewarded by high preferment for their recantation, their love of learning did not always die in their apostasy. Richard Flemmyng, Bishop of Lincoln, under whose episcopal mandate the Reformer's bones were dug up and burned, founded Lincoln College, at Oxford, in 1428. William of Wykeham knew the strength of Wycliffism, and he founded New College in 1379; Waynflete, who had similar experience, founded Magdalene Hall and Magdalene College. Chichele, who had felt that the biblical power of the Lollards could be matched only by similar skill and training, founded All Souls in 1436; Wolsey, who coveted some amount of reform, founded Christ Church; Bishop Foxe, in a similar spirit, founded Corpus

Christi in 1516; and Chancellor Audley, who, though he carried the "Act of the Six Articles," was always suspected of a secret sympathy with the reformers, was the chief establisher of St. Mary Magdalene College, Cambridge. Literature ought ever to be the handmaid of theology, and culture of the highest form is a fitting qualification for the study of Scripture. Many who were hostile to the open study of the Bible were consistently prejudiced against liberal academic tuition—light was not "sweet" to them, nor was it for them "a pleasant thing to behold the sun," unless he were curtained with a thick cloud.

The current objections to an English translation of the Scriptures Tyndale rebuts, with singular vigour, in the preface to the "Obedience of a Christian Man"— . . . "God gave the children of Israel a law, by the hand of Moses, in their mother tongue; and all the prophets wrote in their mother tongue; and all the psalms were in the mother tongue. And there was Christ, but figured and described in ceremonies, in riddles, and parables, and in dark prophecies. What is the cause that we may not have the Old Testament, with the New also, which is the light of the Old, and wherein is openly declared before the eyes, that which there was darkly prophesied? I can imagine no cause verily, except it be that we should not see the work of antichrist and juggling of hypocrites. . . . If the said Scripture were in the mother tongue, they will say, 'Then would the lay people understand it, every man after his own ways.' Wherefore serveth the curate, but to teach him the right way? Wherefore were the holy days made, but that the people should come and learn? But, alas! the curates themselves (for the most part) wot no more what the New or the Old Testament meaneth than do the Turks; neither know they of any more than that they read at mass and evensong, which yet they understand not; neither care they, but even to mumble up so much every day as the pie and popinjay speak. . . . Nay, say they, the Scripture is so hard that thou couldst never understand it but by the doctors. That is, I must measure the mete-yard by the cloth. There be twenty cloths, of divers lengths and of divers breadths; how shall I

be sure of the length of a mete-yard by them? I suppose, rather, I must be first sure of the length of the mete-yard, and thereby measure and judge of the cloths. Ye drive them from God's Word, and will let no man come thereto until he have been two years master of art. First, they nosel them in sophistry. . . . And then corrupt they their judgments with apparent arguments, and with alleging unto them texts of logic, of natural philautia, of metaphysic, and moral philosophy, and all manner of books of Aristotle, and all manner of doctors which they never yet saw. Moreover, one holdeth this, another that. . . . Yet they permit and suffer you to read Robin Hood, and Bevis of Hampton, Hercules, Hector and Troilus, with a thousand histories and fables of love and wantonness, and of ribaldry as filthy as heart can think, to corrupt the minds of youth withal, clean contrary to the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles." While he describes in these graphic clauses the perverse custom of his own age, Tyndale wrote it as if in prophetic anticipation of the damage which philosophy has so often brought upon theology—when the Word of God has been so construed as to be pressed into accordance with some favourite system. Certain metaphysical views of the divine nature and government, and of man's intellectual and spiritual constitution, have lodged themselves in all creeds and confessions. While the mind may be braced by every form of mental discipline, and all spheres of scholarship may be entered and ransacked, to the advantage of true theology; the Bible is still a popular book, designed for universal study. To instruct men it does not employ the tongue of angels. It is written in a style which is meant to be comprehended by the simple inquirer, that its truths may be accepted by the honest and good heart. Divines are not to impose a sense, they are only to educe it. But in those days Aristotelianism held high sway, and the Stagyrice supplied the key to the meaning of St. Paul; while at an earlier time Plato had been enthroned as supreme exegete. Plain men, who had no acquaintance with the current terms of academic thought and logic, were supposed to be in no small peril if they were brought into contact with Scripture, for their use of it would

certainly be the abuse of it, as the following anecdote illustrates. In 1529, when Latimer, in St. Edward's Church at Cambridge, advocated, in his two famous sermons "on the Card,"—the translation and universal reading of the Scriptures, Prior Buckenham soon replied, in another discourse on "Christmas Dice," in the following style: "Thus," he asked, with a smile of triumph, "where Scripture saith, 'No man that layeth his hand to the plough, and looketh back, is meet for the kingdom of God,' will not the ploughman, when he readeth these words, be apt forthwith to cease from his plough, and then where will be the sowing and harvest? Likewise, also, whereas the baker readeth, 'A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump,' will he not forthwith be too sparing in the use of leaven, to the great injury of our health? And so, also, when the simple man reads the words, 'If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee,' incontinent he will pluck out his eyes, and so the whole realm will be full of blind men, to the great decay of the nation, and the manifest loss of the king's grace. And thus, by reading of Holy Scriptures, will the whole kingdom come in confusion."¹ When a preacher so shrewd as this prior could bring himself to utter these grotesque and silly absurdities, with a solemn countenance, in the pulpit, the "beginning of the end" had come, and the triumph of the English Bible was close at hand.

The volumes of the New Testament being finished and sent away, Tyndale had left Worms and gone to the quaint old town of Marburg, in the valley of the Lahn, where he was soon afterwards joined by Fryth, who had escaped from England. Tyndale's heart was "filled with his company." What a tale he had to tell of the work in the mother-land, in the capital, and in the two universities, of alarm and persecution on the one side, and of momentary faint-heartedness on the other, for Barnes had set an example too readily followed. Fryth had been degraded, imprisoned, and forced to flee, on a charge of reading the English New Testament, for the translation of which Tyndale had been for four years and upwards "a fugitive and a vagabond." "But none of

¹ Demaus, *Life of Latimer*, p. 77.

these things moved" Tyndale to swerve from his purpose, and he did not count his "life dear unto him, that he might finish his course." Living "in a strange land, among a people that as well varied from his manners as their persons to him were unknown," his experience was that of the early apostles—"perplexed but not in despair, persecuted but not forsaken, cast down but not destroyed." His own rendering of Galatians vi, 9, must often have suggested itself as a motto for himself and his fellow-wanderer, "Let us do good, and let us not faint: for when the tyme is come, we shall reape without werynes." Unwearied and undaunted, he resolved to persevere, and to translate also the Old Testament. The quiet of the little town favoured his project, and its university, which as the first Protestant one, had been founded by Philip, Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, gave him the free society of learned men, while the press of Hans Luft was a ready and unfettered power. During his sojourn at Marburg he published the "Parable of the Wicked Mammon"—his first publication with his name formally prefixed. "The Obedience of a Christian Man," and the "Practice of Prelates," soon followed. Whatever the value of these writings "for the time then present," and in vindication of his position and work, it is to be regretted that he did not give his whole time to the nobler and more enduring work of translation. The translation of the Old Testament was carried on to the end of the Pentateuch, and printed. The circumstantial story of his shipwreck on the voyage to Hamburg to have it printed, of the loss of the manuscript, and his subsequent assistance from Coverdale, cannot be fully accepted. The story will be again referred to; but it may be noted that Coverdale and Foxe, who reports the incident, were contemporary ministers in London for about ten years. The five Books were circulated separately as they came from the press, and the whole Pentateuch appeared in 1530, the Book of Genesis being dated the 17th of January, "Emprented at Marlborough, in the land of Hesse, by me, Hans Luft, the yere of oure Lord M.CCCC.XXX, the xvii dayes of Januarii." Only one perfect copy survives, and is in the Grenville Library of the British Museum. In

the Bodleian there is a perfect copy of Genesis. Genesis and Numbers are in black letter, with thirty-one lines in a page; Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy in Roman letter, with twenty-eight lines in a page. But it is still probable, in spite of such differences, which cannot be accounted for, that all the books came from the same press, as the ornamental title pages, the form, the wire-lines and watermarks in the paper are the same. A re-issue was published in 1534, with "Genesis new corrected and amended," and the other books were bound up with it into one volume. There is a general introduction, and each book has a special preface. A list, or table, of the more difficult words is appended to Genesis, Exodus, and Deuteronomy, and there were also marginal glosses. Tyndale, striving to make everything clear and distinct, gives the Books a common name, and one also taken from the Vulgate—as "the third Book of Moses, called Leviticus;" "the fourth Book of Moses, called Numerys"—Luther having simply "the third of Moses," and Matthew has "the thyrde Boke of the Kynges after the reckoning of the Latinists, which after the Hebrewes is called the fyrste of the Kynges." Mr. Demaus makes it probable that, with the money which Tyndale got for his books from Packington, he bought from Vostermann the "woodcuts" which had been employed in a Dutch Bible of 1528, and which now appeared in the English Pentateuch, or, more correctly, in the Book of Exodus, as illustrations of the tabernacle and its furniture. The translation was denounced in May, 1530, and during the currency of that year, the translator himself, in his "Practice of Prelates," makes familiar reference to it. Tyndale published also a separate translation of Jonah in 1531, and it was denounced by Bishop Stokesley, on the 3rd December of the same year, as "Jonas in English." Sir Thomas More, in his "Confutation" of Tyndale's Answer, says in his own spirit of magnificent contempt, "Then we have Jonas made out by Tyndale, a book that whoso delighteth therein, shall stand in peril that Jonas was never so swallowed up by the whale, as by the delight of that book a man's soul may be swallowed up by the devil, that he shall never have the grace to get out again." Foxe and Bale refer to it, and it occurs also

in a catalogue of prohibited volumes in 1542. But the translation not being reprinted soon disappeared, and it was so utterly unknown that some even doubted of its existence. The famous prologue to Jonah was re-issued several times, as in the Bibles of 1549 and 1551; but the translation was not inserted by Matthew or Rogers in his Bible of 1537, though he used Tyndale's printed Pentateuch, and his version up to the end of Second Chronicles which the martyr had left in manuscript. The prologue is also found in the usual collected editions of Tyndale's works. Professor Walter even argues against the existence of the translation, chiefly because it is not found in Matthew's Bible, while Cotton and Anderson rightly insist that it must have followed the Prologue. The translation was at length found as accidentally as had been the fragment of the quarto New Testament. Lord Arthur Hervey, Bishop of Bath and Wells, discovered it in the library at Irkworth in the autumn of 1861, as part of a book which had been for two centuries in the possession of his family. The Prologue is a long polemical treatise against prevailing errors, and in defence of the free and literal interpretation of Scripture. It abounds likewise in solemn warnings, for the fate of England was thought to be mirrored in the fate of Nineveh. Prologue and translation were apparently printed at Antwerp, by Martin Emperowr who also printed the Revised New Testament in 1534. The Prologue is prefaced thus: "The Prophete Jonas, with an introduction before, teaching ye to understand him and the right use of all the Scriptures," and at its commencement is the usual address, "W. T. unto the Christen Reader." The translation is thus introduced: "The storie of the prophete Jonas." The translation, along with Coverdale's version, has been very accurately reproduced by Mr. Fry of Bristol, and one may easily compare them.¹ Tyndale's revision of the New Testament must have been postponed, and his continuation of the version of the Old Testament must have been suspended by the publication of his Exposition of the Epistles of John, and by his Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount. The Commentary on the First Epistle of John is strongly polemical and keen in

¹The Prophet Jonas, &c. London, 1863.

tone; but he says truly, "We restore the Scripture unto her right understanding from your glosses." We cannot but regret that he occupied so large a portion of 1531-2 on this work. He felt, however, that more was wanted than a "translation into the vulgar and common tongue; we must also bring the true key to understand it by."

A very few sentences of intrusive digression may be forgiven at this point. During this period the fires of martyrdom had been kindled in England. He whom Latimer so fondly called "his own son in the faith, Bilney, little Bilney, that blessed martyr of God," had some time before borne his faggot in a moment of weakness. But he soon revived, and resolved in the spirit of the Master to "go up to Jerusalem." Having given "to an anchoress" of the episcopal city of Bishop Nikke, a copy of Tyndale's New Testament—a book which had been to himself as the lion's marrow that nursed the heroes of antique story—he was arrested, degraded, and burned, August 19, 1531, in the Lollard's pit, a hollow place near the gate of Norwich. Richard Bayfield, when a monk at Bury, had read the English New Testament, and left his monastery. He was "beneficial to Master Tyndale and Master Fryth, for he brought substance with him, and was their own hand, and sold all their works." He had been dealt with in 1528, and had abjured; but, on relapsing, he was sentenced by Stokesley to the stake, the sentence containing a list of the books in which he had been trading. He was burned at Newgate, 28th November, 1531.

It was natural that Tyndale, when he had completed an English translation of the Christian Scriptures, should turn his attention to the translation of the Jewish Scriptures. To translate them was in every way a more formidable task to him than his earlier work—a task which he must often have surveyed on all sides as he made up his mind slowly and carefully to attempt it. The difficulty of mastering a new and peculiar language did not deter him, and though Hebrew Grammars bristled with barbarous and repulsive technicalities, his courage triumphed. Knowing that "the Law and the Prophets" were the natural introduction to the New Covenant, he longed

to present them to his people in English speech; their prolonged and joyous utterances being, that a Divine Deliverer should appear, and His appearance "in the fulness of the time," with His words and deeds, being the great facts recorded by Evangelists and expounded by Apostles. Greek had, at an earlier period, engaged his attention and study, its immortal harmonies had held him in thrall, and now, though the fervour of youth may have subsided, he must have felt a special fascination in the voices and symbols of the old Semitic seers; in the curt and co-ordinate clauses of the Mosaic legislation; in the rhythm and spiritual beauty of the Psalms; and in the magnificent imagery and varied music of Isaiah, and the other members of the inspired brotherhood. As his preface to Jonah indicates, Tyndale thought also that many of the racy and unsparing denunciations of the Hebrew "men of God," were applicable to England, especially those sections of the Minor Prophets which expounded ethics and polity, which held up popular failings to scorn and censure, which battled against reigning iniquities in rulers and priests, and which always connected sin with penalty, and national degeneracy with national disaster.

In an early century there had been some desire to educate the clergy in Hebrew. At a general council held, under Clement V, at Vienna in 1310, it was provided that Hebrew should be taught in Paris, Oxford, and other universities. Ten years afterwards, at a synod convened at Lambeth under Archbishop Reynold in 1320, it was ordained that there should be a Hebrew lectureship at Oxford, the lectureship being endowed by the tax of a farthing in the pound on all the livings in the province of Canterbury. The first lecturer appointed was John of Bristol, a converted Jew. But the measure seems to have soon collapsed. Two centuries afterwards, in 1524, Robert Wakefield, a friend of Reuchlin, and who had occupied a chair at Tübingen, was sent down by the king to teach the ancient language at Cambridge. Tyndale, therefore, who had left the university before this period, could not have acquired Hebrew at home, but must have learned it from Jews in some of the continental towns in which he sojourned. There were in Worms many Jews whose tuition Tyndale probably enjoyed, and such

earnestness, vigour, and power of application as characterized him could not fail to be crowned with speedy success. The Hebrew Bible had been published in separate parts during several years; but an entire Hebrew Bible appeared at Soncino in 1488, and another at Brescia, 1494. This last was the edition used by Luther in his German translation, and his copy is still preserved in the royal library at Berlin. Bomberg's Hebrew Bible had been published in 1518; the great Rabbinical Bible in 1519 and 1525. But Tyndale could have had few helps. The Hebrew Grammar of Conrad Pellican, the first that appeared, was published in 1503; Reuchlin's Dictionary followed in 1506; and Münster's Grammar in 1525. The Latin translation of the Hebrew Bible, by Pagninus, was published at Lyons in 1528,—the result of twenty-five years' labour, and his *Thesaurus Linguae Sanctae* in 1529. The Complutensian Polyglott, 1517-20, contained both a Hebrew Grammar and Lectionary.¹

As Tyndale translated the New Testament from the original Greek, so his version of the Pentateuch was taken immediately from the original Hebrew. This statement, as in the former case, has been called in question. Fuller's thoughtless words are, "I presume he rendered the Old Testament of the Latin, his best friends not entitling him to any skill at all in Hebrew."² His skill in Hebrew, however, was considerable; but Fuller took no pains to inquire into the matter at all; neither did Johnson, who ventures to say, "Probably, Tyndale rendered the Old Testament out of Latin, having little or no skill at all in Hebrew."³ Macknight hazards the assertion, "It is generally believed that Tyndale did not understand Hebrew, but he of course understood the Latin Vulgate, and he was likewise acquainted with German."⁴ Bishop Marsh writes doubtfully, but with a

¹ Das Studium des Hebraischen Sprache in Deutschland vom Ende des xv bis zur Mitte des xvi Jahrhunderts, Breslau, 1870.

² Church History, vol. II, p. 89, 1837.

VOL. I.

³ Historical Account of the several English Translations of the Bible, in Bishop Watson's Theological Tracts, vol. III, p. 70.

⁴ Preface to Translation of the Epistles, p. 14.

lurking adverse bias, "What knowledge Tyndale had of Hebrew is unknown," and more distinctly, "These translations he made, according to Johnson, not from the Hebrew, but from the Latin Vulgate, or as the Popish writers affirm, from Luther's German translation."¹ Surely Bishop Marsh did not need to rest his decision on any opinion published by Anthony Johnson. Hallam is more cautious—"It has been controverted of late years, whether he were acquainted or not with Hebrew."² Others like Archbishop Newcome,³ and Bishop Grey,⁴ have advanced similar statements. On the other hand, the declaration of Buschius need not be repeated in favour of Tyndale's scholarship, nor the admission of George Joye.⁵ Tyndale's own solemn avowal, in the Preface to the Five Books of Moses, is, that he made his translation from the Hebrew original: "Notwithstanding yet I submit this book and all other that I have either made or translated, or shall in time to come (if it be God's will that I shall further labour in his harvest) unto all them that submit themselves unto the Word of God, to be corrected of them; yea, and moreover to be disallowed and also burnt, if it seem worthy, when they have examined it with the Hebrew, so that they first put forth of their own translating another that is more correct." In a variety of ways, Tyndale indicates his knowledge of Hebrew, never, indeed, boastfully, but rather incidentally as the subject happened to turn up. He gives a critical and comparative estimate in the preface to the "Obedience of a Christian Man": "The properties of the Hebrew tongue agreeth a thousand times more with the English, than with the Latin. The manner of speaking is both one; so that in a thousand places thou needest not but to translate it into English word for word; when thou must seek a compass in the Latin, and yet shall have much work to translate it well-favouredly, so that it have some grace

¹ Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible. Appen-
dix, p. 520.

² Literature of Europe, vol. I, London, 1842.
p. 379.

³ Historical View, p. 25, Dublin, 1792.

⁴ Key to the Old Testament, p. 18,

⁵ See Page 137.

and sweetness, sense and pure understanding with it in the Latin, and as it hath in the Hebrew. A thousand parts better may it be translated into the English than into the Latin." More distinct is his utterance in the prologue to Matthew: "If aught seemed changed, or not altogether agreeing with the Greek, let the finder of the fault consider the Hebrew phrase, or manner of speech, left in the Greek words; whose preterperfect tense and present tense are oft both one, and the future tense is the optative mood also, and the future tense oft the imperative mood in the active voice, and in the passive ever. Likewise, person for person, number for number, and interrogation for a conditional, and such like, is with the Hebrew a common usage."

A melancholy token of Tyndale's love of Hebrew learning remains to be added. M. Galesloot has discovered, in the Archives of the Council of Brabant, a letter written by Tyndale during his imprisonment. In this letter, among other touching requests, he says in pathetic earnestness: . . . "I wish also his permission to have a candle in the evening, for it is wearisome to sit alone in the dark. But above all, I entreat and beseech your clemency to be urgent with the Procureur, that he may kindly permit me to have my Hebrew Bible, Hebrew Grammar, and Hebrew Dictionary, that I may spend my time with that study. And in return, may you obtain your dearest wish, provided always it be consistent with the salvation of your soul."¹

There is besides abundant evidence open to every one that Tyndale's version of the Pentateuch rests on the original Hebrew. He acted wisely in using all the helps within his reach, such as the Vulgate, and the translation of Luther. There are about fifty Hebrew words explained by him in his various writings. A large number of them occurs in his "Treatise on the Sacraments," where he shows that "the Jews are wont ever to name the memorial and sign of things with the very name of the thing signified," and he explains in reference to the "sign," "so are such ceremonies named in Hebrew." In some cases he translates literally, as "Ebenezer"

¹ Demaus, Tyndale, p. 476.

a "help stone," 1 Sam. vii, 12; in Num. vi, he renders Nazarite by "absteyner," in allusion to the meaning which he ascribed to the original term, and the translation is neither after the Luther nor the Vulgate. He renders a clause in Deuteronomy vi, 7, "and whet them on thy children," following Luther,—a metaphor so strong as to be recommended only by its being a literal translation, and it is put into our present margin. Tyndale gives the meaning of Peniel, Mahanaim, El elohe, Israel; explains Pharisee as separated; Caleb, as perfect, applied to a sacrifice; Pesach, as a passing-by; and Hormah, as destruction. Many words occur in his formal list appended to Genesis, Exodus, and Deuteronomy. His explanations show some familiarity with the language, and his very mistakes prove decidedly that he judged for himself, and was not a servile follower either of the German Reformer or of the Latin version.

The first word is Abrech (Gen. xli, 43),¹ which he explains as "tender father," or, as some will, "bow the knee," and our Authorized Version gives, along with the Hebrew term, the first in the margin and the second in the text. Probably the word is Egyptian; but if it be one word, then "bow the knee" might be taken, and the alternative might be "tender king." Now, Tyndale could not get his translation from Luther, who gives the erroneous explanation, "der ist des Landes Vater," nor from the Septuagint, which omits the term and gives "and there heralded before him a herald." He has also improved on the Vulgate² by showing that he took the Hebrew term for an imperative.

Our translators follow Tyndale in many places where he kept close to the original, as indeed he generally does. In Genesis xli, 3, "and stood"³ is the literal rendering, which the Septuagint, Vulgate, and Luther forsake. In verse 6, the literal version is "blighted" or "withered up by the east wind." Tyndale has "blasted with the wind"; our version "the east wind." The Septuagint, Vulgate, and Luther are not so precise, and Luther has simply "versengete,"

¹ אֲבִיךָ² Ut omnes coram eo genuflecterent.³ וַיַּעֲמֵד

singed. He renders Sartabaim (Genesis xxxvii, 36) "chefe marshall," and thus justifies his rendering: "In Hebrew he is called *Sartabaim*, as thou wouldest say, Lord of the slaughtermen. And though that *tabaim* be taken for cooks in many places (for the cooks did slay the beasts themselves in those days), yet it may be taken for them that put men to execution also"—and our present margin embodies the explanation. In his Exposition of Matthew he says, "concerning this word repentance, or (as they used) 'penance,' the Hebrew hath in the Old Testament generally (sob)¹ turn, or be converted; for which the translation that we take for St. Jerome's hath most part *converti*, to turn, to be converted, and sometimes *agere poenitentiam*. And the very sense and signification both of the Hebrew and also of the Greek word is, to be converted, to turn to God with all the heart, to know his will, and to live according to his laws."

Zaphnath-Paanea,² Genesis xli, 45, "Words of Egypt (as I suppose), and as much as to say, a man to whom secret things be opened, or an expounder of secret things, as some interpret it." Now, the Septuagint does not translate the word, but only transfers it. The Vulgate and Luther give a different explanation. The phrase is probably a native one (*lingua Egyptiaca*, Vulgate); Brugsch renders it, "prince of the life of the world"; but Tyndale explains it according to supposed Hebrew analogy.

In expounding Jehovah Nissi, Exodus xvii, 15, which is rendered "the Lord my banner," he adopts another root and gives it as "the Lord is he that exalteth me,"³ the rendering suggested by the Vulgate; Luther leaves the words untranslated. Belial he explains as "he that hath cast the yoke of God off his neck," a derivation found afterwards in Münster, and mentioned by Buxtorf. He always, whether rightly or wrongly, selects for himself a Hebrew root in explaining such names as Avim, Emim, Enache, Zam-zummim, &c.

Tyndale is believed to have carried on his work beyond the

¹ שׁוּב² זַפְנַתְפָּאנְאָא³ Exaltatio mea.

Pentateuch, and to have translated the historical books to the end of Second Chronicles, and it is supposed that this version formed part of the Bible that went by the name of Matthew.¹ In 2 Samuel i, 18, he renders, "And David sang thys song of mournyng over Saul, and over Jonathan hys sonne, and bade to teache the children of Israel the staves thereof"; in our version, "He bade them teach the children of Israel *the use of the bow*." The supplemented prosaic words in italics destroy the sense, as the next clause shows, "behold it is written in the book of Jasher." The real meaning is that the elegy was named the Bow; he taught them the Bow-song. Tyndale assigned to the noun² a root meaning "to collect," and thus got the sense of staves or stanzas, lighting nearly on the real signification by a false etymological conjecture. In the "Obedience of a Christian Man," he says that in Hebrew *cohen*³ is "a minister or officer," rightly giving it a meaning broader than priest. Taking *Horim* from a wrong root meaning "white," he gives it the sense of noble, whereas it denotes cave-dwellers, as its proper etymon indicates. Though the philology in such cases is erroneous, it shows Tyndale's independent handling of the Hebrew, as when he says, somewhat fancifully, "First, *Mammon* is a Hebrew word and signifieth riches or temporal goods; and namely, all superfluity, and all that is above necessity, and that which is required unto our necessary uses, wherewith a man may help another, without undoing or hurting himself; for *hamon*, in Hebrew speech, signifies a multitude, or abundance, or many; and there hence cometh *mahamon* or *mammon*, abundance, or plenteousness of goods or riches." In his rendering, in his Exposition of John i, 1, "the word" or "the things," he wrongly imagines, like many since his time, that the term might bear as many meanings as are ascribed to its Hebrew equivalent *dabar*.

These instances may not prove profound Hebrew scholarship, but they indicate familiarity with the language, and they show original or personal investigation in the treat-

¹ This tradition will be vindicated ^{אמת}
under Matthew's Bible. ^{אמת}

ment of it. He was too earnest and honest a man to simulate the possession of what he had not; but his assertions on points of Hebrew philology are unequivocal, and he well knew that his statements and translations would challenge sharp and unfriendly criticism. His translation of the five books of Moses speaks for itself, for it is clear and simple like the Hebrew which he admired, though occasionally, as in Genesis iv, 3, a meaning is rather wrested than evolved from the words.

In fine, the reader may be interested in a brief selection of quaint and homely renderings. Gen. vi, 4, there were tyrants in the world in those dayes; xxxix, 2, and he (Joseph) was a luckye fellowe; Exod. xxii, 28, thou shalt not rayle upon the goddes; xxviii, 4, a brestlap ephod, a tunycle, a strayte cote; 30, and Aaron shall bear the ensample of the children of Israel upon his herte; 40, an albe of bysse; Lev. vii, 7, dressed upon the gredyren; Deut. xxviii, 5, thyne aulmery and thy store; xxxii, 17, they offered unto felde Devels and not to God; xxxiv, 7, his eye was not dymme nor his chekes abated; Judges v, 22, then they malled the horsse legges that their myghtye coursers lefte praunsynge; viii, 53, and all to brake his brayne panne; xi, 35, thou hast made me stoupe, and arte one of them that trouble me; 2 Sam. xiii, 18, she had a kirtell of diverse coloures; xxii, 39, I wasted them, and so clouted them that they could not aryse; 1 Kings xx, 13, the men of the shires, &c.

The proclamation of 1529 denounced "the chapters of Moses called Genesis, and the chapters of Moses called Deutoronomos." In Ofor's MSS. in the British Museum there is a collation of Tyndale's Pentateuch with that of Taverner's edition of 1539.

CHAPTER XIV.

LUTHER and Zuingli met at Marburg on the 30th September, 1529, in melancholy and fruitless conflict, but Tyndale does not seem to have been on the scene. He took up his final abode in Antwerp some time in 1531, probably at the beginning of the year, or perhaps towards the end of the previous year. The horizon was now beginning to darken around him, the clouds were thickening, and star after star was disappearing in the gloom. Fryth, called indifferently by Cranmer "one Fryth," and contemptuously styled by More "young father Fryth," had won the crown of martyrdom. He had slipped over from the Continent on a previous occasion, and returned again; but on his coming to England in the summer of 1532, he was seized, condemned, degraded, and sent to the stake. More had resigned the Great Seal on the 16th of May, and Cranmer had held the primacy for a few months. But Longland, Stokesley, and Gardyner his old college tutor, examined him, the first of the three pronounced sentence, and he "went to the fire" on the 4th of July, 1533, being at the time under thirty years of age. While he was in prison, he bravely defended his opinions, and his writings are said to have enlightened Cranmer, and to have converted Rastall the printer, brother-in-law of Sir Thomas More. The last sentence of the "Order" of the communion service in the Book of Common Prayer is from Fryth. Tyndale's exile by the death of Fryth became drearier, but his spirit wavered not in toil. He had, as he foreboded, the sentence of death in himself, but he improved the brief respite still to work. "As poor," he was "making many rich," even those in his fatherland, of whom he

might truthfully say, "Ye are in our hearts, to die and live with you." He had long felt the defects of his first edition of the New Testament; and had said in the preface, "In time to come (if God hath appointed us thereunto) we will give it his full shape, and put out, if ought be added superfluously, and add to, if ought be overseen through negligence, . . . and will endeavour ourselves, as it were, to seethe it better, and to make it more apt for the weake stomakes." Several years had passed away and the promised work had not been done. In the meantime, however, several thousands of copies from foreign presses had been put into immediate circulation in England.

There occurred now a peculiar episode in Tyndale's history. George Joye,¹ a scholar and fellow of Peter-House, Cambridge, was now a refugee and "companion in tribulation," for he had fled to the Continent to save his life. He had already been attempting a translation from the Latin text, and had published a Psalter at Strasburg in 1530, the Prophet Isaiah² in 1531, and Jeremiah in 1534. At Antwerp he brought out in an evil hour an edition of Tyndale's New Testament, correcting it from the Vulgate.³ The title is—"The New Testament as it was written and caused to be written by them which herde yt, whom also our Saueowre Christ Jesus commaunded that they shulde preache it unto al creatures." The colophon, which Tyndale in his Vindication singles out, and gives at length, is, "Here endeth the New Testament diligently oversene, and corrected, and prynted now agayn at Antwerpe, by me wydowe of Christoffel of Endhoven. In the year of our Lorde M.CCCCC & XXXIII in August." The matter was kept very secret, and Tyndale, though he was living in Antwerp, does not seem to have been aware of the manoeuvre.

¹ More in the preface to his Con-
futation calls him Joye "the priest,
that is wedded now."

² Joye describes his version of
Isaiah as "Isaie speakinge playne
Englissche."

³ A copy is in the Grenville Lib-
rary, British Museum. It has no
notes, heads of chapters, or pro-
logues; the printing is fair, but the
spelling is bad.

Tyndale was now left alone, and in his sad solitude had been busy revising his translation, which was published in November, and imprinted at Antwerp by Martin Emperowr.¹ The title indicates its nature and suggests its necessity,—“The New Testament dylygently corrected and compared with the Greek.” Tyndale in his “address yet once more to the Christian Reader,” warns with solemn severity against Joye’s production. “Thou shalt understand, most dear reader, when I had taken in hand to look over the New Testament again, and to compare it with the Greek, and to mend whatsoever I could find amiss, and had almost finished the labour, George Joye secretly took in hand to correct it also, by what occasion his conscience knoweth, and prevented me, in so much that his correction was printed in great number, ere mine began. When it was spied and word brought me, though it seemed to divers others that George Joye had not used the office of an honest man, seeing he knew that I was correcting it myself, neither did walk after the rules of the love and softness which Christ and His disciples teach us, how that we should do nothing of strife to move debate, or of vainglory, or of covetousness; yet I took the thing in worth, as I have done divers other in time past, as one that have more experience of the nature and disposition of that man’s complexion, and supposed that a little spice of covetousness and vainglory (two blind guides) had been the only cause that moved him so to do; about which things I strive with no man, and so followed after and corrected forth, and caused this to be printed without surmise or looking on his correction.” That his work should be tampered with in any way by a careless or unscholarly editor, and the trick studiously concealed from him all the while, must have deeply wounded him. To have wantonly touched and retouched a common treatise without authority was wrong; but it was an act of no common daring so to handle the translation which Tyndale regarded as the labour and crown of his life, on which also rested his critical repute and his means of blessing the English people. Joye’s knowledge that Tyndale was diligently working at a revision, was

¹ Sometimes spelled Lempereur.

an aggravation of the offence, for in such a case “he used not the office of an honest man.” “When the printing of mine was almost finished, one brought me a copy and showed me so many places in such wise altered that I was astonished, and wondered not a little what fury had driven him to make such change, and to call it a diligent correction.” Joye did not affix Tyndale’s name to the reprint, though the book was really his with some changes, none of any value or suggested by the original, but only inserted to eke out the sense by unneeded and clumsy supplements. Many of these alterations are, as he confesses, from the Vulgate, and he aimed at “giving many words the pure and native signification.” The result of his effort is a poor, marred, and diluted version. Tyndale argues that Joye should have put his own name to the book, “as it was not expedient for the edifying of the unity of the faith of Christ that whosoever will, shall, by his own authority, take another man’s translation and put out and in and change at pleasure, and call it a correction.” Joye, in his own account, distinguishes between the greater and the minor corrections; in his own phrase, he had “mended a few certain doubtful and dark places,” though, at the same time, he avows, “I have made many changes.” Nay, he had the hardihood to aver that he met in Tyndale’s version with “hard sentences that no reason could be gathered of them, whether it was by the ignorance of the first translator or of the printers,” and that he had made such places “plain from the Latin text.” Yet Joye’s version was done so carelessly, that the error in Tyndale’s first edition in Mark xiv, 5, “two hundred pence” for “three hundred pence” is unnoticed and unchanged, and he had not even looked into the Vulgate.

Joye calls his book in reply “An Apology made by George Joye to satisfye if it may be William Tyndale, to purge and defend himself against so many slanderouse lies feigned upon him in Tyndale’s uncharitable and unsobber pistle, &c.—Lord deliver us from lying lips and from a deceitful tongue. I know and believe that the bodies of every dead man shall rise at doomsday.” He specially prided himself on his change of a verse “darkly translated,” and he had shown his amendment to

Tyndale's scribe, but Tyndale refused it—"though it stand clearer and truer in my correction than in his," and he boldly adds, "let the learned judge." The passage is Acts vi, 1, Tyndale having, "In those dayes, as the nombre of the disciples grewe, there arose a grotte amonge the grekes agaynst the ebrues, because theyr widdowes were despyed in the dayly ministration." Joye's version is, "In these dayes, the nombre of the disciples grewe, there arose a grudge amonge the grekes agaynst the ebrues, because theyr pore nedys were neglece in the dayly almose dealinge."¹ The "Apology," for he was not afraid to answer Tyndale for "all his high learning," is dated 28th February, 1535. The story contained in it has some interest, for it gives a good account of the spurious issues.² "Thou shalt know that Tyndale, about eight or nine years ago, translated and printed the New Testament in a mean great volume, but yet without kalender, concordances in the margin, and table in the end. And anon the Dutchmen got a copy, and printed it again in a small volume, adding the calendar in the beginning, concordances in the margin, and the table in the end. But yet for that they had no Englishman to correct the setting, they themselves having not the knowledge of our tongue, were compelled to make many more faults than were in the copy, and so corrupted the book that the simple reader might oft times be tarried, and stick. After this they printed it again, also without a corrector, in a greater letter and volume, with the figures in the Apocalypse, which was therefore much falsier than their first. When these two prints (there were of them both about five thousand books printed) were all sold, more than a twelvemonth ago, Tyndale was pricked forth to take the Testament in hand, to print it and

¹ Anderson's *Annals*, vol. I, p. 396. In 1541, he published a small book against adultery, "printed at London, by George Joye." The motto on the last leaf is 1 Cor. vi, 9-10; and in its translation, for the single epithet "covetous," he has

"greedy, covetouse, insaciabl, de-
ceitfull, gatherers;" and for the
epithet "extortioners," he has "nor
pyllers and pollars."

² See Waterland's *Letters to Mr. Lewis*, Works, vol. VI, p. 305, &c. ed. Van Mildert, Oxford, 1856.

correct it, as he professeth and promiseth to do in the latter end of his first translation. But Tyndale prolonged and deferred to so necessary a thing, and so just desires of many men; in so much that, in the mean season, the Dutchmen printed it again the third time, in a small volume like their first print, but much more false than ever it was before. And yet was Tyndale here called upon again, seeing there were so many false printed books still put forth, and bought up so fast; for now was there given, thanked be God, a little space to breathe and rest unto Christ's Church, after so long and grievous persecution for reading the books. But yet, before this third time of printing the book, the printer desired me to correct it,¹ and I said, 'It were well done, if ye printed them again, to make them truer, and not to deceive our nation with any more false books; nevertheless, I suppose that Tyndale himself will put it forth more perfect and newly corrected, which if he do, yours shall be nought set by, nor never sold.' This notwithstanding, yet they printed them, and that most false, and about two thousand books, and had shortly sold them all. All this long time Tyndale slept, for nothing came from him as far as I could perceive. Then the Dutch began to print them the fourth time, because they saw no man else going about them; and after they had printed the first leaf, which copy another Englishman had corrected for them, they came to me, and desired me to correct them their copies, when I answered as before: 'If Tyndale amend it with so great diligence as he promiseth, yours will never be sold.' 'Yes,' quoth they, 'for if he print two thousand, and we as many, what is so little a number for all England? and we will sell ours better cheap, and, therefore, we doubt not of the sale.' So that I perceived well, and was sure that, whether I had corrected this copy or not, they had gone forth with their work, and had given us two thousand more books falslier printed than ever we had before. Then I thus considered with myself: England hath enough and too many false Testa-

¹ Joye refers to the octavo and ignores the quarto with its marginal furniture. He had wealth of names —Joye, Jaye, Gee, and More adds, "otherwise called Clarke."

ments, and is now likely to have many more; yea, and that whether Tyndale correct his or no, yet shall these, now in hand, go forth uncorrected too, except somebody correct them; and what Tyndale doth, I wot not, he maketh me nothing of his counsel. I see nothing come from him all this long while, wherein, with the help that he hath, that is to say, one both to write it and to correct it in the press, he might have done it thrice since he was moved to do it. For Tyndale, I know well, was not able to do it without such an helper, which he hath ever had hitherto."

Had Joye been contented to reprint Tyndale correctly, he would have conferred a benefit on all English readers, but he was snared by his own ambition, and he failed, as so often happens to improvers in painting and architecture. He acted doubly, to say the least of it, and his charge of indolence against Tyndale contradicts all that we know of his busy existence. But his words imply that several surreptitious and badly printed editions of the New Testament had been issued, and had he sent from the press another edition without the natural and numerous blunders ascribed by him to the foreign printers, he would have earned hearty thanks. But his work brought obloquy upon him, for it was Tyndale's without his name, and disfigured, too, by changes that could never have got the translator's sanction.

One special translation by Joye, Tyndale felt obliged to protest against, the change of the word resurrection and the employment in its room of "life after this," and similar phrases, as in Matthew xxii, 30, 31, and Mark xii, though he retained it in cases where the rising of the body is distinctly intended, as in 1 Corinthians xv, and Philippians iii. Joye and Tyndale had often disputed about the nature of the soul-life, between death and the resurrection, and Tyndale had manifested impatience at Joye's arguments, "filliping them forth between his finger and his thumb after his wonted disdainful fashion." Joye's view was the common one, that souls pass into a higher life at death. Tyndale did not dispute this doctrine; but his own opinion had wavered, for he said in his controversy with More, "the souls of the dead lie and

sleep till doomsday." But he had now obtained clearer conceptions, and he "protests before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and before the universal congregation that believeth in him, that he held and maintained it in perfect accordance with Scripture." Tyndale's more recent view is in harmony with Scripture, which teaches not simply the immortality of the soul, but the immortality of man, asserts that Christ came not to save souls as a portion of our nature, but to save human beings; lays far more stress on the resurrection than our popular theology supposes; looks on the separate existence of the soul after death as an insignificant parenthesis in our existence, and takes almost no notice of it when it is out of the physical organism created for it; implies that an unembodied spirit, whatever be its brightness, happiness, and service in the Divine presence is imperfect; and sets before us the last day as the epoch of our glorification, when our nature in all its spheres shall be perfected in Christ, and prepared for, and admitted into everlasting blessedness. Tyndale's words in his Protestation are, "Nevertheless, I confess openly, that I am not persuaded that they be already in the full glory that Christ is in, or the elect angels of God are in." Tyndale, repeating the unfounded accusation that he had hastily made against Sir Thomas More, hints that covetousness might mingle with George Joye's motives for interfering with his work, but the implied charge falls to the ground. The printers offered him a remuneration of threepence a sheet of thirty-two pages, and he closed the hard bargain at fourpence halfpenny. His own curious account is that, "the printer came to me agen, and offred me two stivers and a halfe for the correcking of every sheet of the cotype; which folden containeth sixteen leaves; and for three stivers, which is fourpence halpeny sterling, I promised to do it. So that in al I had for my labour but fourteen shylyngis flemesshe." And he affirms that had it not been for the goodness of the deed, he would not have done it for five times that sum. There is no record of Tyndale's receiving money for any of his works; but Joye rebuts the charge of covetousness by

asserting that "Tyndale took ten pounds for his correction." Luther complains that all he received was often a single copy of a Book on its publication, while other writers, even translators, frequently got an angel for every eight leaves. But in one of his casual utterances Joye merits our thanks: "In good faith, as for me I had as lief put the truth into the text as in the margent; and except the gloss expound the text, or where the text is plain enough, I had as lief leave such frivole glosses clean out. I would the Scripture were so purely and plainly translated, that it needed neither gloss nor scholia, so that the reader might once swim without a cork." It is difficult to say whether Joye means by these words to deprecate Tyndale's marginal references; but the statement certainly involves a momentous truth, and shows that he had just ideas of the general nature of a good translation.

That Joye was not devoid of ambition appears incidentally from Tyndale's postscript to his second letter to Fryth, relating that "George Joye at Candlemas, being at Barrow, printed two leaves of Genesis in a great form, and sent one copy to the king and another to the new queen, with a letter to N. for to deliver them, and to purchase licence, that he might go through the whole Bible. Out of that is sprung the noise of the new Bible, and out of that is the great seeking for English Books at all printers and bookbinders in Antwerp, and for an English priest that should print." Joye had some malice in him too, for he ventures to say in his "Apology," in spite of the eulogy which he had pronounced upon Tyndale's learning, "that he wondered how Tyndale could compare the translation with Greek, sith himself is not exquisitely seen therein." And not only so, but he accuses Tyndale of praising his own Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount (1532) "so highly, that forsooth, my ears glowed to hear him, and all the while it was Luther that made it, Tyndale only but translating and powdering it here and there with his own fantasies."¹ Tyndale tells Fryth in his letter that "George Joye would have put forth a treatise 'on the Sacrament,' but I have stopped him as yet; what he will do, if he get money, I wot not." But he did

¹ Apology, sig. F, III, b.

publish so smart an attack on Bishop Gardyners "False Articles" that the bishop was obliged to answer it. Joye was afterwards unjustly accused, both in Antwerp and in England, of being privy to the plans for the apprehension of Tyndale. "His friends greatly blamed him and abused him falsely and wrongfully," so that he left Antwerp, and went to Embden, where he published the "Subversion of More's faulse foundation," &c. In 1545 he published at Geneva an Exposition of Daniel, and, returning to England, he died in 1553.

Tyndale's revised New Testament, in the preface to which he exposed George Joye, came out in 1534, the title being "The Newe Testament, dilygently corrected and compared with the Greke by Willyam Tindale, and fyneshed in the yere of oure Lord God M.D. & xxxiiii, in the moneth of November." W. T. to the Christen reader, fills seventeen pages; a prologue to the four Evangelists, four pages; W. T. yet once more, &c., nine pages. A table of the Epistles and Gospels for Sundays, occupys sixteen pages; and there are "some things added to fill up the leffe withal," consisting of five pages. The second title runs, "The Newe Testament, imprinted at Antwerp, by Marten Emperowr, Anno MDXXXIII." A page has thirty-three lines. In this edition not only are prologues prefixed to the several books, but the church lessons are also marked, and there is a translation of the "Epistles," taken out of the Old Testament, which "are read in the church, after the use of Salisbury, upon certain days of the year." These "Epistles" include seventy-eight verses from the Pentateuch, fifty-one from 1st Kings, Proverbs, and Canticles; one hundred and forty-seven from the propheticall books, chiefly Isaiah; and forty-three from the Apocrypha, in excerpts from Esther, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus, no less than six selections being from the latter book. This spontaneous work shows that Tyndale did not hold such strong views about the Apocrypha as his biographer, Mr. Anderson, ascribes to him; nay, Mr. Anderson unaccountably omits altogether the passages from the Apocrypha, when he gives a list of the places in the Old Testament translated by Tyndale.

In the Protestation, or, as he calls it, "William Tyndale yet once more unto the Christian Reader," he speaks in the fulness

of a heart in which love for the truth and for the diffusion of it in his fatherland had absorbed every other emotion. "Moreover, I take God to witness (which alone seeth the heart) to record to my conscience, beseeching Him that my part be not in the blood of Christ, if I wrote, of all that I have written throughout my book, aught of an evil purpose, of envy or malice to any man, or to stir up any false doctrine or opinion in the Church of Christ, or to be author of any sect, or to draw disciples after me, or that I would be esteemed or had in price above the least child that is born. Also my part be not in Christ, if mine heart be not to follow and live according as I teach; and also if mine heart weep not night and day for mine own sin and other men's, indifferently beseeching God to convert us all, and to take His wrath from us, and to be merciful as well to all other men as to mine own soul; caring for the wealth of the realm I was born in; for the king and all that are thereof, as a tender-hearted mother would do for her only son.

"As concerning all I have translated or otherwise written, I beseech all men to read it, for that purpose I wrote it, even to bring them to a knowledge of the Scripture; and as far as the Scripture approveth it, so far to allow it; and if in any place the Word of God disallow it, there to refuse it, as I do before our Saviour Christ and His congregation. And where they find faults, let them show it me if they be nigh, or write to me if they be far off; or write openly against it, or improve it; and I promise them, if I perceive that their reasons conclude, I will confess mine ignorance openly."

The revision fully bears out Tyndale's honest and noble profession. In it the Vulgate is forsaken oftener than in the first edition. Thus, he inserts the Doxology in Matthew vi, 13. Erasmus had admitted it in his fourth edition of 1527, which, however, Tyndale does not seem to have used. Some erroneous renderings remain unchanged, as "backbiter," in Ephesians iv, 27; and he gives this rendering also in the conclusion of his prologue to St. Matthew, and in the "Obedience of a Christian Man"; "founde in his aparrell as a man," Phil. ii, 8; "honestly apparelled," 1 Timothy iii, 2; "lordes over the

parishes," 1 Peter v, 3. But every verse bears marks of a careful treatment. The minuter alterations show the attention and taste of a painstaking scholar, labouring to bring his translation as close as possible to the original. His own scholarship had improved during the last nine years, and he had profited by his experience as a translator. He could now enter more deeply into the spirit of the Greek text, and, feeling its wondrous beauty and compactness, he became endowed with the power of seizing minuter shades and more delicate turns of thought, and of giving them a more apt and felicitous rendering. No change to the better was beneath his notice, whatever might contribute to clearness and vigour he at once laid hold of. He felt that, in the book he was translating, not only were the "lamps of pure gold," but even "the snuffers and the snuff dishes" were of the same precious metal—not to be dimmed or tarnished by any careless human handling. Many of the changes introduced by him keep their place in our present New Testament, and that after having passed through several revisions in the Great Bible, the Genevan, and the Bishops'. The following collation is a proof and sample:—

	1526.	MATTHEW V.	1534.
Verse			
1	disciples cam vnto hym.		disciples came to hym.
9	mayntayners of peace.		peacemakers.
11	men shall revyle you.		men revyle you.
13	if the salt be once unsavery.		yf ye salt have lost hir saltness.
„	but to be caste oute at the dores, & that men treade it vnder fete.		but to be cast oute, & to be troaden vnder fote of men.
15	all them which are.		all that are.
16	so that youre light.		let your light.
17	to disannull.		to destroye.
19	shall teache.		teacheth.
„	shall observe & teache them, that persone shalbe called greate.		observeth & teacheth, ye same shal be called greate.
21	whosoever shall kill.		whosoever killeth.
22	But whosoever shall saye vnto his brother thou fole.		But whosoever sayeth, thou fole.
23	eny thyng agaynst thee.		ought agaynst the.
24	reconcile thy silfe.		be reconcyled.
25	at once.		quicklye.

Verse	1526.	MATTHEW V.	1534.
25	thine adversary at once.	thyne adversary quicklye.	
28	eyeth a wyfe.	looketh on a wyfe.	
31	a testimonyall of her.	a testimonyall also of the.	
35	the grete king.	that greate kynge.	
36	one heer whyte or blacke.	one whyte heer, or blacke.	
39	ye withstond not wronge.	ye resist not wronge.	
„	But yf a man.	But whosoever.	
40	and take thy coote from the.	and take away thy coote.	
45	youre heavenly Father.	your fathel that is in heaven.	
46	Yf ye shall love them.	Yf ye love them.	

MATTHEW VI.

1	youre father in heven.	youre father which is in heven.
7	But when ye praye.	And when ye praye.
„	gentyls.	hethen.
12	as we forgeve them which tras- pas vs.	as we forgeve oure trespassers.
13	Leede vs not into temptacion, but delyvre vs from yvel. Amen.	And leade vs not into temptacion but delyver vs from evell. For thyne is the kingdome and the power and the glorie for ever. Amen.
16	that hit myght apere vnto men that they faste.	that they myght be sene of men how they faste.
21	there are youre hertes also.	there will youre hertes be also.
22	The light off thy body.	The light of the body.
„	ys full of light.	shalbe full of light.
24	he shall lene the one.	he shall lene to the one.
25	what rayment ye shall weare.	what ye shall put on.
26	Are ye not better than they?	Are ye not moche better then they?
28	Behold the lyles.	Considre the lylies.
34	Care not therefore for the daye foloynge; For the daye foloynge shall care ffor yt sylfe. Eche dayes trouble ys sufficient for the same silfe day.	Care not then for the morow, but let the morow care for it selfe; for the day present hath ever ynough of his awne trouble.

MATTHEW VII.

1	Judge not lest ye be judged.	Judge not that ye be not judged.
4	suffre me to plucke oute a moote oute off thyne eye.	suffre me to plucke oute the moote oute of thyne eye.
9	which wolde proffer his sonne a stone if he axed him breed.	which if his sonne axed hym breade wolde offer him a stone.

Verse	1526.	MATTHEW VII.	1534.
11	them that axe off hym.	them that axe hym.	
14	For strayte ys the gate.	But strayte is the gate.	
21	he that fulfilleth my father's will.	he that dothe my father's will.	
22	And in thy name have we not caste oute devyls? And in thy name have we nott done many miracles?	And in thy name have caste oute devyls? And in thy name have done many miracles?	
25	and it was not over throwen.	and it fell not.	
26	doth not the same.	doth them not.	
27	and it was over throwen.	and it fell.	

GALATIANS I.

1	congregacion.	congregacions.
5	for ever. Amen.	for ever and ever. Amen.
10	Seeke nowe the faveour off men, or off God?	Preache I mannes doctrine or Godes?
13	ye have heerde.	For ye have hearde.
„	in tymes past.	in tyme past.
14	more fervently mayntayned the tradicions.	more fervent mayntener of the tradicions.
18	vnto Peter.	to se Peter.
24	glorified god in me.	glorified God on my behalffe.

CHAPTER II.

1	I went agayne.	I went vp agayne.
2	I went by.	I went vp by.
„	which are.	which were.
9	& as sone as James, Cephas, & Jhon, which semed to be pil- lares, perceaved the grace thatt was geven vnto me, they gave to me & Barnabas their hondes.	& therfore when they perceaved the grace that was geven vnto me, then James, Cephas, & John, which semed to be pilars, gave to me & Barnabas the ryght hondes.
11	When Peter.	And when Peter.
14	To folowe the Jewes?	to live as do the Jewes?
16	and we have beleved.	and therfore we have beleved.
„	because that noo flesshe shal be justified by the dedes off the lawe.	because that by the dedes of the lawe no flesshe shal be justified.
20	the lyfe.	For the lyfe.
21	then is Christ deed in vayne.	then Christ dyed in vayne.

1526. GALATIANS III. 1535.

Verse

4	ye have suffred in vayne, yf it be so that ye have suffred in vayne.	there ye have suffred in vayne, if that be vayne.
7	They which are of fayth, are the children.	the same are the chyldren.
8	The scripture.	For the scripture.
„	and shewed.	and therfore shewed.
13	Christ hath.	But Christ hath.
14	that we might.	& that we might.
16	thy seedes.	the seedes.
17	confermed of god.	confermed afore of God.
19	vnto which seede the promes.	to which ye promess.
21	Yff there had bene.	Howbeit yf ther had bene.
27	put Christ on you.	put on Christ.
28	nether greke.	nether gentyle.
„	nether fre.	ner fre.
„	nether woman.	ner woman.
„	for all are one.	but ye are all one.

CHAPTER IV.

5	shulde receave.	myght receave.
8	not goddes.	no goddes.
10	the dayes.	dayes.
11	I fear offe you.	I am in feare of you.
12	hurte me.	not hurte me at all.
13	ye knowe wele how that.	ye knowe how.
14	the flesshe.	my flesshe.
15	digged out youre awne eyes.	plucked out youre awne eyes.
16	Am I so greatly become.	Am I therefore become.
30	Cast a waye.	put awaye.

CHAPTER V.

5	We loke for & hope to be justi- fied by the sprete which com- meth of fayth.	We loke for & hope in the sprite, to be justified thorow fayth.
10	In god.	In the Lorde.
11	I then suffre.	I then yet suffre.
12	sondred.	seperated.
20	lawynge.	variaunce.
„	parte takynges.	sectes.
21	shall not be the inheritours.	shall not inherite.
22	off the sprete.	of sprete.
23	is there no lawe.	there is no lawe.

1526. CHAPTER VI. 1534.

Verse

2	Beare one another's burthen.	Beare ye one another's burthen.
3	yff a man seme.	If eny man seme.
8	in the flesshe.	in his flesshe.
9	Let vs do good, and let vs not faynte.	Let vs not be wery of well doynge.

Several of these changes may not be improvements, but in the great majority of them there is an apparent effort to secure greater accuracy of rendering, and more clearness and concinnity of expression.

Many of Tyndale's terms have been changed in the course of successive revisions. Similitude has passed into parable, health into salvation, counterfeit into follow, favour into grace, congregation into church, hallowed loaves into unleavened bread, Easter into passover (except in one instance), it fortun'd or it chanced into it came to pass, love into charity, dearth into famine, captain into centurion, laude into praise, &c.

George Harman, of Antwerp, had, as recorded on a previous page, been imprisoned along with his wife,¹ at the instance of Hacket the English envoy and the authorities at home, and he had been expelled from the "English House." The Lords of Antwerp released him in February, 1529, after seven months confinement, and some years afterwards he visited England, and found a patron in Queen Anne Boleyn who had been crowned on the 1st of June, 1533. A letter from her to Crumwell, dated 13th May, 1534, "at my Lord's Manor at Greenwich,"² and beginning with "Anne the Queen," has been preserved, telling what penalty he had suffered "in the time of the late Lord Cardinal"; boldly setting forth the crime charged upon him that, "he like a good Christian man, both did with his goods and policy help to the setting forth of the New Testament in English;" and asking him "to be restored to his pristine freedom, liberty, and fellowship, and the sooner at our request."³ Tyndale

¹ See p. 178.² Cotton MSS., Cleopatra, E. V., involved in a perilous adventure fol. 330. Strype's Annals, vol. I, in 1529, with a copy of Tyndale's part 1, p. 171.³ The "Lady Anne" had been "Obedience of a Christian Man," and

had been informed of this royal interposition, and as a fitting memorial of his earnest gratitude, he threw off a copy of his revised edition on vellum, with beautifully illuminated capitals, but without name, dedication, or preface, and sent the volume to her Majesty. This Testament, not in the original binding, is now in the British Museum, and when the book is kept firmly shut, there may be read in dim red letters on the fore-edge of the leaves, on the top Anna, on the centre Regina, and on the bottom Angliæ.

Tyndale published another edition in 1535. Joye in his Apology, intimates that it was then in hand, but before it was printed the translator was betrayed and imprisoned. There were indeed two editions, in 1535, the one no doubt Tyndale's own work, and the other a surreptitious issue. The one edition, 1534-1535, has a second title dated 1534, which had been printed with the text at the end of that year, the preliminary leaves, as being the last portion of the volume thrown off, having the date 1535, and on the title, "yet once agayne corrected by Willyam Tindale." This edition has a monogram G. H. on the second title, and its genuineness may be assumed from the fact that its readings are usually adopted in Matthew's Bible. Having been for a brief period the translator's "own familiar friend," Matthew must have selected it as Tyndale's last and best production. The other edition "fynessed" in 1535, and "dyligently corrected and compared with the Greke by Willyam Tindale," is to all intents that of 1534, but with 833 changes, few of which, however, can be called scholarly emendations.¹ The following collation affords a specimen, and is a portion of Mr. Fry's monograph on the subject, 1 Corinthians being selected:—

had brought upon herself the suspicion and resentment of Wolsey, a short time before his fall—the Seals being taken from him on the 18th of October.

¹ See Mr. Fry's monograph, prepared with marvellous minuteness and

accuracy—"Three New Testaments of William Tyndale, that of 1534, 1535, 1535-1534, and the text of Matthew's first edition"—a portion of a larger work on Tyndale New Testaments. There are some misprints and omissions in Matthew.

COLLATION OF ED. 1534, GH 1535-34, AND MATTHEW 1537.

Ch.	Ver.				
1	11	'34 GH ... M	(my brethren) of you by ...	'35 ...	(my brethren) of you by
			them		them
—	24	'34 GH ... M	and the wisdom of God ...	'35 ...	and wisdom of God
2	4	'34 ...	preaching were not with	GH '35 M	preaching was not with
—	7	'34 GH '35 ...	ordained before the world ...	M	ordained before the word
—	8	'34 ...	the rulers of the world	GH '35 M	the rulers of this world
3	6	'34 ...	God gave increase ...	GH '35 M	God gave the increase
—	7	'34 ...	which gave the increase	GH '35 M	that gave the increase
—	20	'34 GH ... M	God knoweth the thoughts...	'35 ...	God knoweth thoughts
—	22	'34 ...	other, 4 times in the verse	GH '35 M	either, 4 times in the verse
5	4	'34 GH ... M	in the name of our Lord ...	'35 ...	the name of our Lord
—	8	'34 GH ... M	and wickedness ...	'35 ...	omitted
6	5	'34 GH ... M	I say to ** not one at all ...	'35 ...	I lay to * * not one all
7	6	'34 ...	not of commandment ...	GH '35 M	and not of commandment
—	33	'34 GH ... M	he that hath married ...	'35 ...	he that had married
—	37	'34 GH ... M	his virgin doeth well ...	'35 ...	his virginite doeth well
8	3	'34 GH ... M	if any man love God ...	'35 ...	if any man loveth God
—	7	'34 GH '35 ...	eat as of a thing offered ...	'35 ...	M eat as a thing offered
—	10	'34 ...	are offered unto the idol	GH '35 M	are offered to the idol
9	1	'34 ...	are not ye my work ...	GH '35 M	are ye not my work
—	8	'34 GH ... M	or saith not the law ...	'35 ...	saith not the law
—	11	'34 GH ... M	is it a great thing ...	'35 ...	it is a great thing
—	13	'34 GH ... M	have their finding ...	'35 ...	have they finding
—	14	'34 GH ... M	so also did the Lord ...	'35 ...	so did the Lord
—	—	'34 GH ... M	should live of the gospel ...	'35 ...	omitted
—	21	'34 GH ... M	without law became I ...	'35 ...	without the law became I
10	19	'33 GH ... M	is offered to images ...	'35 ...	is offered to the images
—	20	'34 ...	I say that those things	GH '35 M	I say that these things
—	21	'34 GH '35 ...	cannot be partakers ...	M	cannot be the partakers
—	27	'34 GH ... M	bid you to a feast ...	'35 ...	bid you to the feast
—	32	'34 ...	ye give occasion ...	GH '35 M	ye give none occasion
11	13	'34 GH ... M	that a woman pray ...	'35 ...	that a woman prayed
—	25	'34 ...	this cup is the new testa-	GH '35 M	omitted
			ment of my blood		
—	—	'34 GH '35 ...	in the remembrance ...	M	in remembrance
—	29	'34 GH ... M	maketh no difference ...	'35 ...	maketh not difference
—	31	'34 GH '35 ...	we had truly judged ...	M	we have truly judged
—	33	'34 GH '35 ...	tarry one for another ...	M	tarry one another
12	3	'34 GH '35 ...	but by the Holy Ghost ...	M	but the Holy Ghost
—	8	'34 GH ... M	to another is given ...	'35 ...	to another given
—	12	'34 GH ... M	though they be many yet are	'35 ...	omitted
			but one body		
—	23	'34 ...	members of that body ...	GH '35 M	members of the body
—	24	'34 GH ... M	hath given most honour ...	'35 ...	hath given more honour
14	6	'34 GH '35 ...	unto you other by revelation ...	M	to you other by revelation
—	29	'34 GH '35 ...	let other judgo ...	M	let the other judge
—	30	'34 GH ... M	be made to another ...	'35 ...	be made on another
15	2	'34 ...	by which also ye are ...	GH '35 M	by the which also ye are
—	10	'34 ...	not I but the grace ...	GH '35 M	yet not I but the grace
—	12	'34 ...	from death ** from death	GH '35 M	from the dead ** of the dead

COLLATION—*Continued.*

Ch.	Ver.	COMPARISON CONTINUED									
15	13	'34	...	...	...	rising again from death	GH '35	M	rising again of the dead		
—	15	'34	...	...	...	rise not up again...	GH '35	M	rise not again		
—	20	'34	...	...	...	Christ risen from death	GH '35	M	Christ risen from the dead		
—	21	'34	...	...	...	resurrection from death	GH '35	M	resurrection of the dead		
—	28	'34	...	...	...	they put all things under	GH '35	M	that put things under		
—	29	'34	GH	...	M	if the dead rise not at all	...	'35	...	if the dead rise not all	
—	33	'34	GH	...	M	malicious speakings	...	'35	...	malicious speaking	
—	34	'34	GH	'35	...	this unto your rebuke	...	...	M	this to your rebuke	
—	43	'34	GH	...	M	and "ryseth" in honour	...	'35	...	and "rysed" in honour	
—	50	'34	...	...	...	corruption inheriteth	GH '35	M	doth corruption inherit		
16	3	'34	GH	...	M	allow by your letters	...	'35	...	allow by our letters	
—	12	'34	GH	'35	...	his mind was not at all	...	...	M	his mind was not all	

The edition of 1535 is also marked by peculiar spelling. Tyndale had promised at Sodbury that "if God spared his life, he would cause a boy that driveth the plough to know more of the Scriptures than a priest." This strange spelling has been supposed, by Mr. Walter among others, to be a conformity to the rustic dialect of Gloucestershire in fulfilment of his early pledge. But such a theory fails of proof, and the probability is that the flat diphthongal orthography was the fruit of Flemish printing, copy being read off to a compositor who did not know English. Similar pronunciations are yet common in Flanders, and might also have been heard, not many years ago, in some parts of Morayshire. The following are a few specimens:—First, an *e* put after an *o*, which is the commonest form—aboede, boeke, cloeke. Second, an *e* put after an *a*, which is also very common—aege, aere, maey, laey, faether. Third, sometimes the *o* is doubled—booth, boones, coostes, oonly, hoow, stoon, loo for lo, whoom, moor, moost. Fourth, sometimes an *e* after a *u*—ruele, ruelers, truethe. Fifth, sometimes an *a* after an *o*—moane for mone. Sixth, an *a* after an *e*—hear for her. Seventh, sometimes *ee*—heere for here. There are other forms, as *te* for the, *tappe* for toppe, *tought* for taught, *vyneyaerde* for veneyarde, *woeld* for would, *woerde* for worde, *woere* for where, *yought* for youth.

CHAPTER XV.

AFTER the publication of the Pentateuch, Tyndale was proceeding with the Hebrew Historical Books, when his work was brought to an abrupt termination.

Vaughan had been at a previous period instructed to persuade Tyndale to return to England under promise of protection. But he intimated to Crumwell, 26th January, 1530-31, that the task was hopeless, for "Tyndale daily heareth so many things from thence which feareth him." "Would God," he adds, "he were in England." There was at that time no covert design to entrap him, or to coax him to come over and then seize him. Vaughan afterwards informs the king, 17th April, that he had an interview with Tyndale in the fields near Antwerp; that he had avowed his fervent and patriotic loyalty, and his reluctance to come home, because the king would not be able to keep his promise to protect him against the bishops, for they affirmed that no faith should be kept with heretics. Vaughan's despatch got him into trouble, as he was supposed to be favourably inclined towards the exile, and Crumwell replied, "Withdraw your affection from the said Tyndale, and all his sort; the king's highness would be much joyous of his conversion."¹ Vaughan again met Tyndale, and thus reports his words: "If his majesty would grant only a bare text of Scripture to be put forth among his people, like as is put forth among the subjects of the emperor in these parts, and of other Christian princes, be it of the translation of what person soever shall please his majesty, I shall make faithful promise

¹ Vaughan seems to have thought Crumwell some secret information that George Constantine had given against him.

never to write more, nor abide two days in these parts after the same; but immediately to repair unto his realm, and there most humbly submit myself at the feet of his royal majesty, offering my body to suffer what pain or torture, yea, what death his grace will, so that this be obtained. And till that time I will abide the asperity of all chances, whatsoever shall come, and endure my life in as much pains as it is able to bear and suffer."¹ The Translator, in defiance of mighty and malignant influences, was still unshaken; his courage remained firm and unflinching amidst many perils closing surely and darkly about him. He rose to sublimity of resolution as his end drew nigh, for his words were no idle bravado—no mere self-glorifying ejaculation, as the event was so soon to prove.

During his abode at Antwerp, Tyndale continued his studious life, giving himself wholly to his book, taking his "pastime" on Monday and Saturday; on the first of these days visiting and relieving all the refugees, "seeking every corner and hole," and imparting liberal charities to the poor and distressed, for he had "a considerable yearly exhibition" from the merchants. On the Lord's Day he held worship in private with such of the merchants as might assemble "in some chamber or other, and read a parcel of Scripture." He could not join in the public Catholic worship, and Sir Thomas More as usual puts it strongly, "He neither crieth out, nor halloweth, nor baiteth, nor buzzeth, as they say that know him; he saith none at all, neither matins, evensong, nor mass." A story told by Foxe, and occupying a special place in a remarkable book, needs not be repeated at length.² It tells that he was taken to see a conjurer at Antwerp, who did many marvellous things, and "brought to table by his art all that could be desired" of wines and delicious fruits; but that in the Reformer's presence he "wearied himself with spells, charms, and incantations," and all the resources of "hellish skill" in vain, so that he cried out in great wrath that

¹ Cotton MSS., Galba, b. X, fol. 5, 6. Mathematics in the University of

² "Satan's Invisible World Discovered," by George Sinclair, Professor of Moral Philosophy and Glasgow. Edinburgh, 1685. Reprinted at Edinburgh, 1871. The story is Relation xxii, p. 154.

there was "one in the company that hindered his work." The magician could not do his dexterous manipulations under the sharp eyes of the shrewd and unsusceptible Englishman.

Vaughan was a kind-hearted man, and boldly appealed to the king to extend mercy to reformers like Barnes and Latimer, intimating that the fear of punishment sent many fugitives to the Continent, and hardened them in their opinions, so that by this means, "it is likely that new Tyndales shall arise, or worse than he." Another agent was therefore selected to work out a sterner purpose than to plead with the Translator to return to England—the object now being to apprehend him on the Continent. Tyndale had been aware of his peril, and may have left Antwerp for a time, continually shifting his residence, and some have supposed that he went for a brief period to Nuremberg. Sir Thomas Elyot, a friend of Sir Thomas More, undertook the degrading task of seizing him; and, in a despatch to the Duke of Norfolk, admits that his stay at Brussels, in obedience to the royal mandate to seize the exile, may be protracted—"considering that like as he is in wit movable, semblably so is his person unable to come by;" and that aware of the king's order to arrest him, "he withdraweth him into such places where he thinketh to be farthest out of danger."¹ Information about him had been for a considerable period carefully sought for in England by the bishops and Sir Thomas More, and in examining "any poor man under coram," who had been in Antwerp, they put such questions anent Tyndale as, "where and with whom he hosted, whereabouts stood the house, what was his stature, in what apparell he went, what resort he had," &c.² Suspicion so haunted him, that he was in doubt of Vaughan's purpose at their first interview; and the envoy describes him as being "somewhat fearful of me, lest I should pursue him. He took leave of me, and departed from the town, and I toward the town. Howbeit, I suppose, that he afterwards returned to the town by another way." The "wise man's eyes are in his head," and Tyndale informs Fryth, "My Lord of London hath a servant called John Tisen, with a red beard and black reddish head, and

¹ Cotton MSS., Vitell, xxi, fol. 58. ² Foxe V, p. 121, Registers of London.

who was once my scholar; he was seen in Antwerp, but came not among the Englishmen. Whether he is gone an ambassador secret, I wot not." Sir Thomas Elyot writes, in November, 1533, "I gave many rewards, partly to the emperor's servants, to get knowledge, partly to such as by whose means I trusted to apprehend Tyndale." In the prosecution of the futile enterprise he had contracted considerable debts.

From about the middle of 1534 Tyndale had lived in Antwerp, with Thomas Poyntz, one of the English merchant adventurers. But the secret of his residence in the "English house," was discovered, and a man named Philips, son of a "customer" at Poole, and Gabriel Donne, "won his confidence." The first of the two passed as a gentleman, and the second as his servant. "In the wily subtleties of this world Tyndale was simple and inexpert," and when Poyntz got suspicious and questioned him, the innocent victim pronounced "Philips an honest man, handsomely learned, and very conformable"—yielding to Tyndale's arguments and opinions. Tyndale even lent him money; on the very morning of his capture he gave him the loan of forty shillings, it being asked as a pledge of mutual confidence. These spies now procured the necessary powers, and then, when he least expected it, trading on his unsuspecting nature they got him into their power by nefarious treachery. As he was leaving the house, taking the traitor familiarly with him, to dine at the dwelling of a friend, Philips had him arrested by means of lurking accomplices, who "pitied to see his simplicity." The contrivers of the plot are unknown. Halle darkly hints, "Tyndale was betrayed and taken, as many said, not without the help and procurement of some bishops of this realm."¹ That some ecclesiastical influence had been at the vengeful work may be naturally inferred. Donne was a monk of Stratford Abbey, near London. On his return from the Continent he was appointed Abbot of Buckfastleigh in Devonshire; but he yielded his abbey in 1539, and got a pension of £120 a year. He was afterwards a prebendary of St. Paul's, and keeper of the spiritualities of the

¹ Halle's Chronicle, p. 818, London, 1809.

diocese till 1550. Philips had two benefices and a prebend in England. He "persisted in person with constant diligence" going from Louvain to Brussels and to Vilvorde, and urged on the process against Tyndale, which, from Crumwell's influence, might have fallen asleep. A warrant being sent across to arrest him for treasonable language, he could not return to England, and soon fell into poverty. He went to Italy to secure the patronage of Cardinal Pole; but, being suspected as a spy, he was roughly barred from entering the Venetian territory.

Poyntz had no doubt that the arrest was made "by procurement out of England," but unknown to the king's grace. Tyndale was arrested on the 23rd or 24th of May, 1535, and conveyed to the castle of Vilvorde, about eighteen miles from Brussels. His imprisonment lasted a year and one hundred and thirty-five days. There had been unfounded rumours of the king's interference. Though Marshe, the governor of the English House, had been indifferent at first, the English merchants interposed, and applied to the Regent Mary, but without effect; a charge of heresy being, under the emperor, as dangerous as one of treason, and the procureur-general, Dufief, was as inexorable as his master. Measures were taken in England to move Crumwell to interfere on the prisoner's behalf, as may be learned from the letter of Tibold, a godson of the English minister, and in the confidence of Cranmer. In a communication, dated the last day of July, he informs Crumwell, "he that did take Tyndale is abiding in Louvain, with whom I did there speak; which doth not only there rejoice of that act, but goeth about to do many more Englishmen like displeasure." The betrayer, he adds, "was greatly afraid of the resentment of the Antwerp merchants, who will lay watch to do him some displeasure privily;"¹ and he writes to Cranmer, on the last day of July, in reference to other interviews with Harry Philips, "I could not perceive the contrary by his communication but that Tyndale shall die, which he doth follow and procureth with all diligent endeavour, rejoicing much therein, saying

¹ Cotton MSS., British Museum, probably sent to make inquiries, Galba, B x. Tibold or Theobald was among other things, about the arrest.

that he had a commission also to have taken Doctor Barnes¹ and George Joye." Poyntz, writing to his brother John Poyntz of Ockenden in Essex, bears also cordial testimony to the integrity, simple-heartedness, and beneficence of Tyndale, "the which is in prison and like to suffer death. This poor man hath been in my house three quarters of a year; I know that the king has never a truer-hearted subject to his grace this day living. I think he shall be shortly at a point to be condemned; and there are two Englishmen at Louvain busy in translating out of English into Latin those things that may make against him." The earnest interference of Poyntz led to his own incarceration for four months, and when he effected his escape, the keeper of the prison was fined eighty pounds on suspicion of connivance.²

During Tyndale's imprisonment his New Testament was passing through the press at home, the enterprise being perhaps patronized by Queen Anne and her party. Berthelet has been long supposed by Ames (Herbert), Anderson, Dibdin, and Cotton, to be the printer of this first New Testament issued in England; but Mr. Bradshaw, of the University Library, Cambridge, assigns it to T. Godfray. The engraved border was in the possession of Godfray before it belonged to Berthelet, and the transfer was not made so early as 1536.³ If Tyndale had secret intelligence of the preparation of the volume, the news must have filled him with unutterable gladness, and he must have felt a blessed compensation for months and months of exile and peril, in the assurance

¹ But Barnes was now an envoy for the king to the German States. Buckenham was in Louvain too—he that preached the sermon at Cambridge in reply to Latimer, Philips paying all charges.

² The entry of the amount of the fine paid "for carelessness and negligence" by the jailor, John Baers, to the counsellor in ordinary of the emperor, and receiver of escheats and fines, &c., may be seen in Demans, p.

497. Poyntz came back to England, and, on the death of his brother, took possession of the paternal inheritance. He died in 1562, and his escape from prison is noted in his epitaph. The lady of Sir John Walsh, who had Tyndale as a tutor to her children, was a Poyntz of Gloucestershire, of the same lineage as the family in Essex.

³ Westcott, p. 51, second edition.

that the Blessed Book, which for eleven years had been produced by strangers, and had reached his fatherland in stealthy and circuitous ways, was now printing in the metropolis. The Bodleian Library possesses a copy. Several editions were issued at Antwerp about this time, as may be seen in Anderson's list.

Though Henry hated Luther with a perfect hatred, he had no reason to hate Tyndale. Tyndale was a Yorkist indeed,¹ but the king's mother was Elizabeth of York, the lineal heir; and if he did not approve of the divorce, he certainly would have supported the royal supremacy for the denial of which Fisher and More were both beheaded. The disloyal language of the two spies against the king plainly showed that they belonged to the reactionary party, no member of which could be so deep in the royal confidence as to be trusted with their errand. But Henry had no right to interfere, as he had burned some of the emperor's subjects on a similar charge. Crumwell wrote twice in favour of Tyndale to the Marquis of Bergen-op-Zoom, and to Carondelet, Archbishop of Palermo, and was not listened to. These letters were sent to the care of an English merchant at Antwerp, of the name of Flegge who did what he could; and in sending to Crumwell the answer of the high personages appealed to, he expresses "a hope that it may be to the king's pleasure and yours," implying that the king had acquiesced in his minister's interference for the release of Tyndale.

At this time, Coverdale, under Crumwell's protection, had finished his translation of the entire Bible, to be dedicated, within a brief time after, to King Henry, and at length to be authorized by him. But Tyndale's treatises must have provoked many to hostility, for they were trenchant and unsparing, and bore hard, like his "Practice of Prelates," on the popish priesthood. His arrest and death may be traced in all probability

¹ "They slew the right king, and Tyndale could not like the Laneset up three false kings in a row, castrian kings, for besides being Henrys IV, V, VI, by which usurpers, two of them had been mischievous sedition, they caused such persecutors. Works, vol. II, half England to be slain up." pp. 53, 224, Parker Society edition.

to ecclesiastical malignity, which slowly and secretly compassed its end without caring to consult the king or his ministers, who, from political complications, at home and abroad, were helpless to interpose in favour of any relaxation with Charles or his Regent. There were 72,000 executions in England during Henry's reign, and a life more or less could not be felt by the king or his council to be of any great moment, especially the life of one so friendless and so long absent from the island. One of Tyndale's letters, written in prison to the governor, the Marquis of Bergen-op-Zoom, whose favour for him Crumwell had already asked, has been discovered, and a portion of it has been already quoted. The noble-hearted prisoner was so reduced as in his cold and rags to beg with touching and mournful earnestness, "your lordship, and that by the Lord Jesus, that if I am to remain here during the winter, you will request the procureur to be kind enough to send me from my goods which he has in his possession, a warmer cap, for I suffer extremely from cold in the head, being afflicted with a perpetual catarrh, which is considerably increased in the cell. A warmer coat also, for that which I have is very thin; also a piece of cloth to patch my leggings; my shirts are also worn out. He has also a wollen shirt of mine, if he will be kind enough to send it. I have also with him leggings of thicker cloth for putting on above; he also has warmer caps for wearing at night."¹ At length a commission was named for the trial of Tyndale, and it comprehended four divines from the University of Louvain. There were long written discussions that passed from the prison to Louvain, for Tapper and Lathomus were no mean antagonists. Ruwart Tapper was a subtle scholastic, and Lathomus had attacked Erasmus, and affirmed that a knowledge of Hebrew and Greek was not necessary to the study of Scripture. In 1528 the divines of Louvain had sent a letter of congratulation to the Archbishop of St. Andrews on the burning of Patrick Hamilton.² Vaughan, who had now returned from England, in a letter to Crumwell from Antwerp, April 13th, expresses some hope for the prisoner. "If now you send me but your letter to the Privy

¹ See p. 211.² Foxe, vol. IV, p. 561.

Council, I could deliver Tyndale from the fire; see it come by time, or else it will be too late." The envoy spoke his own wishes, and overrated his influence.

Tyndale could have but little hope himself; for even in England he would have been in serious peril, and he must often have thought in those dreary months of his own words written eight years before: "If they burn me, they shall do none other thing than I look for." His condemnation and martyrdom were certain from the first. His doom was pronounced on the 10th of August, and he was then "degraded, and condemned into the hands of the secular power." On Friday, the 6th of October, 1536, he was first strangled—for the law of the Low Countries was more merciful than that of England—and then burned. At the moment before his death, he cried with fervent zeal and a loud voice at the stake, "Lord, open the king of England's eyes." According to Foxe, his life and words produced a deep impression on his jailor, his jailor's daughter, and others who were permitted to visit him. And so died "one, who, for his notable powers and travel, may well be called the apostle of England in this our later age."

And truly Tyndale did an apostle's work, in presenting divine truth to the souls of men, and he was blessed at the same time in suffering all manner of evil during such work with "patience and wonders"—"the signs of an apostle," for he was filled with the true spirit, endowed with gifts that descended from Pentecost, and set apart by a nobler consecration than the laying-on of hands. Men so thoroughly furnished and absorbed in evangelical toil and travail are surely "the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ." To labour for the Divine Master is one phase of conformity to Him who "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister"; but to suffer also for Him who yielded His life for us, seals and completes the assimilation. "And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they? And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.

Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them."

While Wycliffe and Tyndale may have some unavoidable resemblance in their translation of simple historical clauses, the Latin being at the same time a version from the Greek; the following four verses of a peculiar structure will show the independence of Tyndale:—

GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE, CHAPTER I, VERSES 1-4.

WYCLIFFE.

Forsothe for manye men enforce-
den to ordeyne the tellyng of thingis,
whiche ben fillid in vs, as thei that
seyn atte the bigynnyng, and weren
ministris of the word, bitaken, it is
seen also to me, hauynge alle thingis
diligentli bi ordre, to write to thee,
thou best Theofile, that thou knowe
the treuthe of tho wordis, of whiche
thou art lerned.

TYNDALE.

For as moche as many have taken
in hond to compyle a treatise off thoo
thynges, which are surely knowen
amonge vs, even as they declared
them vnto vs, which from the be-
gynnyng sawe them with their eyes,
and were ministers at the doying: I
determined also, as sone as I had
searched out diligently all thinges
from the begynnyng, that then I
wolde wryte vnto the, goode Theo-
philus, that thou myghtest knowe
the certente off thoo thinges, whereof
thou arte informed.

CHAPTER XVI.

IN his introduction to the first edition of the *Novum Instrumentum*, or Greek New Testament, Erasmus, while vindicating the right of all to read the Scriptures, and maintaining that they should be translated into all languages, adds as a climax, "and be read and understood by Scots and Irishmen." These nations, though they were to him the lowest in the scale of civilization, might have a translated Bible, and next to them he places Greeks and Saracens. But copies of the Wycliffite version had already been carried into the northern kingdom, and the translation of Tyndale soon found its way into Scotland, probably as early as to England, for Scotland had a close mercantile connection with the Low Countries, especially with the towns of Middleburg and Campvere. Hacket, the English ambassador at Antwerp, who had fallen into such trouble about Tyndale's New Testament, wrote to Wolsey on the 20th of February, 1527, that he had advertised Brian Tuke, on the 4th of January of the same year, that there were "divers merchants of Scotland that bought many of such like books, and took them into Scotland, a part to Edinburgh, and most part to the town of St. Andrews,"¹ adding, "that he had expected to make a seizure at Barrow; but that to his chagrin the ships had left before his arrival."² The allusion is

¹ St. Andrews was then the capital of Scotland, and Glasgow ranked only as eleventh in the taxation list of royal burghs. In the date of its

Andrews the seventh. Its university was founded in 1411, that of Glasgow in 1450.
² Cotton MSS., Galba., B. VI, charter it is the twenty-first, and St. fol. 4.

to Tyndale's Testaments, which he was so anxious to discover, and destroy, and he had also received copies from England in order to identify the version. Hacket's language implies that the practice of carrying away such books in trading vessels had been a common one before it had been distinctly observed and watched. There was as yet in Scotland no prohibition of such literary imports, nor for five years to come, though in 1525 there had been an enactment against "strangers" bringing with them any books of Luther, and in August, 1527, "natives or the king's lieges" are comprehended in the prohibition, the inference being that they had already been engaged in the traffic. Leith, Montrose, and Aberdeen were parts as accessible as St. Andrews, and they were all visited by vessels carrying Tyndale's New Testaments to a ready and secret market.

Patrick Hamilton,¹ born in the city or diocese of Glasgow, the young and intrepid reformer, related by both his parents to the royal blood of Scotland, had returned from the Continent, and begun to preach the Gospel; but going to St. Andrews, on a treacherous invitation of the primate, he was placed under espionage, tried with great pomp on thirteen different articles, and burned before the gate of the College of St. Salvador, the same day on which his judges returned their verdict—Saturday, 28th February, 1528. The burning of the martyr lasted six hours. Campbell, Prior of the Order of Blackfriars, had betrayed him, and now as prosecutor he pressed as the first and special charge against him his confession that "it is lawful for any man to read the word of God, and in special the New Testament." But his martyrdom did not kill the Reformation, and a shrewd friend said to the archbishop, "My lord, if ye burn any more, except ye follow my counsel, ye will utterly

¹ His name stands under the year 1528 in a register of Acta Rectoria of the University of Paris as Patricius Hamelto, Glassguensis, Nobilis. His Loci, translated by Fryth at Marburg, were long a popular digest of theology, and went by the name of "Maister Patricks Places." They may be seen in Foxe, vol. IV, p. 563, or in Laing's edition of Knox's Works, vol. I, p. 19. He was present at the inauguration of the University of Marburg, and his name survives on the first page of the Album.

destroy yourselves. If ye will burn them, let it be in how (hollow) cellars, for the reek (smoke) of Master Patrick Hamilton has infected as many as it blew upon."

In October of the same year, Rinck, writing from Cologne to Wolsey, makes the disclosure, already told, that Bibles enclosed in packages, and artfully covered with flax, were by sea "taken into Scotland and England as to the same place, and sold as merely clean paper."¹ As the panic spread, prohibitions became more sweeping and stringent, and among others the bishops issued a ban declaring that the New Testament was neither to be read in the vernacular nor sold. The particulars with allied instances are to be found in a letter of Alexander Ales² to King James V. His proper name was Alane, and so it is written in the old registers of the University of St. Andrews. He was a native of Edinburgh, born in 1500. He had been a canon in St. Andrews, and owed his religious change to conversations with Patrick Hamilton during his imprisonment, and was now an exile from Scotland for the "Word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ." "Whence," he asks, "shall they hear sound doctrine if they are not allowed at home to read the books of the Gospel?" and he mentions, "that travelling abroad, he had heard of the king or emperor enacting laws against dogmas, but not against the reading of the Scriptures." In a reply to an attack of Cochläus, he nobly vindicates domestic reading of the Scriptures, which was so common in Germany, "even in many places which have no business with Luther," and he exposes the common trick of confounding all versions of the sacred books with Luther's translation. "I have heard the chief among our

¹ See page 179.

² The name Ales was coined for him by Melanchthon, Ἀλῆσιος, wanderer, suggested by the similarity of Alane to ἀλείνω. Melanchthon occasionally plays upon the meaning of the name, and in reference to his own troubles fears that he would be forced to "become another Alesius." Though

Mr. Anderson will not admit it, there is sufficient proof that Melanchthon helped Alesius in the composition of his letters to the king. The "Wanderer" settled at length as Professor of Divinity at Leipzig, where he died in 1565. Lorimer's Patrick Hamilton, p. 241, Edinburgh, 1857.

preachers declare that this same version, (Tyndale's in Scotland) gave them more light than many commentaries." The restless Cochläus¹ replied to Ales on the 8th of June, 1533. In the course of his letter he urges the employment of force, after the example of the Bishop of Treves, who had ordered first one bookseller, and then another, to be cast into the Rhone with their pernicious books; asserts that the New Testament of Luther is not the sacred book, but execrable and cursed; is not the Gospel of Christ, but of Satan; and bids the king desist from favouring any version, especially at this time, since the best and most undoubted translation in the vulgar tongue is productive of all possible mischief. The king was not disposed to cruelty, and had more than once interfered in behalf of the oppressed; but he was overborne by such ecclesiastical counsellors as the most profligate Prior Hepburn of St. Andrews, and David Beaton, afterwards the notorious cardinal. Henry Forrest, of Linlithgow, was apprehended and condemned "for nou uther cryme but because he had ane New Testament in Engliss," and in 1533 he was burned at "the North Church style of the Abbey of St. Andrews, that all the people in the shire of Forfar might see the flames." Other executions followed in the next year, for the Scottish ecclesiastics were not behind their English and foreign fellows in blindness, cruelty, and thirst for blood, and therefore Scotland, though it be but a small country, has an illustrious roll of confessors and martyrs.

¹ Cochläus, in his reply to Morysyn, charges Henry VIII with ingratitude, and complains that royalty had been unmindful of his poverty and his merits. But in September, 1534, he sent a servant to Edinburgh with one of his tracts, *pro Scotia regno Apologia*, for there appears this entry in the accounts of the Lord High Treasurer, September, 1534, "Item, to ane servantt of Cocleus whilk brocht frae his maister ane buyk intitulat. . . . To his reward L.l., that is £50 Scots." Anderson's Annals, vol. II, p. 467. Ales says that, according to the statement of Cochläus himself, he had been nobly rewarded by the Scottish king, James V, and by the Archbishops of St. Andrews and Glasgow.

COVERDALE.

Not myself, but the truth that in life I have spoken ;
Not myself, but the seed that in life I have sown,
Shall pass on to ages, all about me forgotten
Save the words I have written, the deeds I have done..

 'Tis clear, if we refuse
The means so limited, the tools so rude
To execute our purpose, life will fleet,
And we shall fade, and nothing will be done.

CHAPTER XVII.

IN many intellectual and spiritual movements, while one man by his genius, persistence, or bravery towers above his fellows, another often stands by him, somewhat overshadowed by his greater height—second to him, but still essential to the final success of the enterprise. In such a relation stood Paul and Barnabas, Luther and Melancthon, Calvin and Beza, Tyndale and Coverdale. The translation of the Bible was the chief end of Tyndale's existence. The purpose was his own, formed in his inmost soul, and in the intensity of a great and ardent nature it was inwrought like a subtle influence into all the fibres of his being, fostered apart from all minor pursuits with a "godly jealousy," and pressing into its service all learning and all time. He could not be wiled away from his work, except to interpret it and defend it, and he never relaxed from it till he was "carried whither he would not." His independence, decision, earnestness, and presentiment of martyrdom might seem to impart somewhat of hardness to his temperament, and the fruit might appear to hang on a leafless bough. There was, however, no sullenness about him, though he was alone among strangers that could not appreciate him; adversity had not embittered him; but his history and his mission shed a profound solemnity over him, and every word and act was viewed in the light of high principle, and of an eternity which he felt to be ever nearing him. Complimentary terms were beneath him, and his affectionate greetings, as those to Fryth, were without efflorescence. His sincerity did not garnish itself with cheap sentiment; his honesty did not robe itself in purple; his

eye was single, and his aim was definite. To give his country a faithful and idiomatic version of the Divine Word, a true reflection of the inspired original, was his one labour; for it he lived, and for it he died a homeless, solitary exile and martyr.

His successor, Coverdale, was a man fitted in all ways to act a secondary part. Loyal to truth and conscience, he was not characterized by mental independence. It was not his nature to cherish a self-born resolve, or act it out apart from advice and consultation. He liked to lean on some one; and while he was honest and persevering, he was singularly susceptible of impression and guidance. Tyndale never had a patron, but Coverdale, though he does not seem to have begged patronage, or to have ever abased himself in order to keep it, yet liked to nestle under it. The unctuous style of his time does not suffer in his hands, as when he tells Crumwell that "like Jacob, he has obtained the chief blessing;" and concludes, "farewell, thou ornament of learning and of counsels, and, in fine, of every virtue." His instinct was rather to follow than to discover the path of duty. He seems to have had little confidence in himself, but he had great faith in the judgment of others. He was afraid to take any momentous step till others had suggested it, or at least till he had taken counsel with them about it; but he set himself without hesitation to do his work when it had been clearly pointed out to him. He could not lead; he preferred to be led as friends directed, or circumstances seemed to warrant or indicate. While, in Tyndale's experience, duty became a divine necessity to which, at all hazards, he ever responded, Coverdale was advised and urged to the work of translation. He did not venture upon it as a competitor for fame, "not as a checker, not as a reprover or despiser of other men's translations," and he appears now and then to be on the point of offering an apology for engaging in it at all. "Now, for thy part, most gentle reader, take that I here offer thee with a good will, and let this present translation be no prejudice to the other that out of the Greek have been translated before, or shall be hereafter;"¹ and in another allusion to Tyndale he adds,

¹ Prologue to the New Testament of 1538.

"Notwithstanding, when I considered how great pity it was that we should want it so long, and called to my remembrance the adversity of those which were not only of ripe knowledge, but would also with all their hearts have performed that they had began, if they had not had impediment, considering, I say, that, by reason of their adversity, it could not so soon have been brought to an end as our most prosperous nation would fain have had it I was the more bold to take it in hand."¹ He uniformly and repeatedly disclaimed all merit as the founder of the enterprise, confessing, however, to have felt the influence of one subsidiary motive, that as other nations were more plenteously provided with the Scriptures in "their mother tongue" than his own, he would do his best to supply the want.²

Tyndale knew his powers, and put a high estimate on his translation, as a work of earnest industry and scholarship, and he could defend it with lofty spirit and sternness against such assailants as Sir Thomas More and George Joye. But Coverdale had no overweening estimate of the value of his labour, for his hope and prayer was that "if it was not worthily ministred, God shall send it in a better shape." In unaffected humility he was content if his version served only as a foundation "for another to build thereon," and he kept his word. So utterly unselfish was he that he worked heartily at a new edition intended to supersede his own. He had no gall in his nature; was not one of those men who consider a work to be ill done if they have not a chief share in the doing of it. He was far in spirit from another class who, if their own plot have little greenery, are compensated by the thought that a worm is twining itself round

¹ Prologue to the Bible of 1535.

² Before 1477 there had been four editions of the German Bible, and ten more followed within forty years. There had been an Italian Bible in 1471, and in about thirty years there were nine other editions. A French Bible appeared in 1487;

Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Bohemia, and Poland had their Bibles at an early period. All that had been printed in England was Bishop Fisher's Exposition of the Seven Penitential Psalms. Wynkyn de Worde, London, 1509.

the root of their neighbour's gourd. Tyndale sharply resented any attempt to tamper with his work, and claimed the sole power to amend it; but Coverdale, in the preface to his Diglott Testament, avows, "Yet, forasmuch as I am but a private man, and am obedient unto the higher powers, I refer the reformation and amendment thereof unto the same, and to such as excel in authority and knowledge."¹ These words should scarcely have been written by a skilful and painstaking translator, conscious of doing his best in his very responsible task. Were we not assured of his honesty and simple-heartedness, we should regard him as guilty of wretched obsequiousness, when, after all his toil, patience, and prayers, he ends his royal dedication of his Bible by the morbid avowal, "I thought it my duty, and to belong unto my allegiance, when I had translated the Bible, not only to dedicate this translation unto your highness, but wholly to commit it unto the same, to the intent that, if anything therein be translated amiss, it may stand in your grace's hands to amend it, to improve² it, yea, and clean to reject it, if your godly wisdom shall think it necessary." Though all this protestation is undoubtedly genuine, it indicates a marvellous facility of temperament, the absence of all self-reliance, a morbid proneness to self-depreciation, and a total want of ambition to be earliest in suggestion or first in progress. But he took his own place, and willingly filled it without envy, jealousy, or uncharitableness, and heartily did he welcome any coadjutor or successor. Provided the work was done, he did not covet identification with it, though he did not publish anonymously as did Tyndale at first. Tyndale would not have become a translator at all if he could not have rendered directly from the original texts; but Coverdale, with lowlier aim, scrupled not to confess on his first title-page that his Bible was "translated out of Douche and Latyn into Englishe." Tyndale's convictions were firm, and he was ever ruled by them; but Coverdale was so flexible as to say, "here the Hebrues begynnethe X Psalm," and yet to mark the next Psalm as the tenth also, according to

¹ Prologue to the New Testament, or reject, as in his own version of 2 printed by Francis Regnault, 1838. Tim. iv, 2, "improve, rebuke, exhort,"

² "Improve," (improbo) to condemn and also in Tyndale.

the other numeration; and he could note, in reference to a portion of the fourteenth Psalm found in the Vulgate, "these thre verses are not in the Hebrue," and yet he puts them without hesitation into his text. In his professed translation of the Vulgate New Testament, he forsakes the form of the Lord's Prayer in St. Luke, and, unfaithful to his purpose as told on his title-page, he follows the Greek, but he admits the inconsistency in his Preface. In his Prologue he quietly accepted "Vulgarius" from a strange error of Erasmus,¹ who gave Theophylact a name derived from his diocese of Bulgaria. Quaintly and earnestly he opens his soul to the reader: "If, when thou readest this or any other like book, thou chance to find any letter altered and changed, either in the Latin or English (for the turning of a letter is a fault soon committed in the print), then take thy pen and mend it, considering that thou art as much bound so to do as I am to correct all the rest." And the concluding words are the coinage of his heart: "And what edifying soever thou receivest at any man's hand, consider that it is no man's doing, but cometh even of the goodness of God, to whom only be praise and glory."²

Miles Coverdale was born about 1488 in the North Riding of Yorkshire, and probably in the district that gave him his own name, Cover-dale, which lay in what was called Richmondshire. Of his youth and early life nothing is known, though Hoker³ describes him as "from his childhood given to learning, wherein he profited much." He was, at a fitting age, attached to the Convent of the Augustines at Cambridge,⁴ and, according to Tanner, was admitted in 1514 to priest's orders at Norwich by John, Bishop of Chalcedon. Barnes, who became Prior in 1523, at length espoused the reformed doctrines, and his influence brought many around him over to his views.

¹ Erasmus who, in Latinizing his own Dutch name, had made two blunders, does not get very well out of the oversight of taking the geographical term for a proper name. His assertion that his MS. was all but illegible is said not to be fully borne out. Drummond's Erasmus, vol. I, pp. 315, 316.

² Prologue to the reader, Diglott.

³ Catalogue of the Bishops of Exeter.

⁴ This convent shared the fate of many similar establishments in 1539.

When or how Coverdale got into the good graces of Crumwell, to whom he styles himself "your poor child," we have no means of ascertaining, but at an early period he enjoyed his patronage. In a letter dated 26th August, 1527, he writes to Crumwell, "If I knew that my coming to London might stand with your favour, truly the bird was never gladder of the day than I would be to come. It remains with you to command as you will the abilities of your Miles. Tuus quantus quantus Milo Coverdalu."¹ At a later period, in making a request to him for his printer, his appeal is, "according to your most loving and favourable manner of old." He attended along with other anxious inquirers the meetings held at the White Horse, a building close to St. John's College, and placed so conveniently that members of King's and Queen's might enter it without being observed, and which, on account of the Lutheran notions held by many who frequented it, was often, as Foxe says, called "Germany." Their opinions spread, and their zeal grew. Barnes² was publicly arrested, and search was made in the University for heretical or Lutheran books; but Dr. Farman, of Queen's, gave timely notice to the suspected parties. In the meantime Coverdale escaped annoyance, probably through Crumwell's influence, though he had so far committed himself that he followed Barnes to London, and was occupied with him in the Fleet Prison in the preparation of his defence. He continued to maintain his evangelical profession, threw off his monastic habit, left his convent, and, in the words of Bale, "while others dedicated themselves in part only, he gave himself wholly up to the preaching of the Gospel." His arguments and appeals as he laboured at Bumstead in Essex made converts, some of whom, on being arrested and examined by Bishop Tunstall, laid the blame on Sir Miles Coverdale and his discourses,³ which opposed the mass, the confessional, and the worship of images. Thomas Topley, an Augustine friar of Stoke Clare, confessed, when examined in 1528, that having heard Sir Miles Coverdale preach, "his mind was sore withdrawn from the blessed sacrament, insomuch that he took it

¹ State Papers, vol. VII, No. 67.

² See page 167.

³ On the title Sir, as given to a priest, see pages 118, 119.

but for the remembrance of Christ's body." Such accusations, made before a tribunal so terrible showed the reformer that he was no longer perfectly safe in England, and he went across to the Continent. According to Foxe's record, he met Tyndale in Hamburg, and stayed with him from Easter to December, 1529, in the house of a "worshipful widow," Mistress Margaret Van Emmerson, during a violent epidemic, and helped him to translate the Pentateuch.¹ But the gossip, though circumstantially told, has no corroborative support, and, wanting coherence, is not in some points very credible. Coverdale may have met Tyndale somewhere on the Continent, but from his ignorance of Hebrew he could have given him only such subordinate help for the Old Testament as Friar Roye had afforded for the New. There is no allusion either by Tyndale or Fryth to Coverdale's presence or assistance in any place or at any time, and surely these two martyrs cannot be accused of any unworthy prejudice created by rivalry in Biblical labour. Besides, there is no proof that Tyndale visited Hamburg after his second journey to it in 1524, and he could not come to that city, "minding to print his translation of Deuteronomy in it," as Foxe so naively relates, for at that epoch it had no printing press, and apparently no books were printed in it before 1536. Tyndale may have gone to the northern seaport on some other errand, and may have met Coverdale; yet Foxe, who relates the anecdote about this abode in Hamburg from Easter to December, places Tyndale's interview with Packington at Antwerp about the middle of August in the same year.² Genesis was printed in January, 1530, at Marburg, and Tyndale could scarcely be absent from that city for so long a period as nine months of the previous year, for he must have been preparing his translation, and superintending it at press.

From this period, in 1528 till 1535, the places of Coverdale's residence are unknown. It has been conjectured by Foxe that he visited Denmark. But if the date assigned by the

¹ There seems to have been, according to Offor's testimony, what-
of a senator; and there was a
"sweating sickness" in 1529.

ever be its value, a lady of that name
at this time in Hamburg, the widow

² See pages 179, 180.

Royal Commissioners, who first published the following letter, be accepted, he must have gone back for a time to his old convent, and through his powerful patron his return might involve him in little peril. The letter is addressed to Crumwell, "his singular good master," "From the Augustines this May day," and subscribed "your chyld and beedman in Jesu Chryst, Frere Myles Cov'dale." Its date is supposed to be 1531, or 1532, though it may be earlier; and after the custom of his day, he writes, "For now I begyne to taste of Holy Schryptures: now (honour be to God) I am sett to the most swete smell of holy lettyres,¹ with the godly savour of holy and awncyent Doctoures, unto whose knowledge I cannot attayne, without dyversyte of bookys, as is not unknown to your most excellent wysdome. Nothyng in the world I desyre but books as concerning my lernynge. They once had, I do not dowte but Allmyghty God schall perfourme that in me, whych He, of Hys most plentyfull favour and grace, haith begone."² Whatever truth may be in the surmises just mentioned, it is certain that Coverdale was in obscurity for a considerable period, but that time had not been wasted. During his earlier residence on the Continent he must have learned German,³ and thus prepared himself for his heavy task, which, in all likelihood, he had already commenced. At least the letter just quoted, while it may allude to Biblical study generally, would seem by its special terms to imply that he had made some progress with the translation. He must again have gone over to the Continent, though the date is uncertain, and there undisturbed and withdrawn from public notice, he finished his great work.

We have already seen that, on the 24th of May, 1530, a council was held at Westminster, which, among other topics, discussed the question of an Authorized Bible—a question forced upon it by the conviction of the people that the king

¹ Latimer says, referring to the period of his conversion, "from that time forward I began to smell the Word of God." Crumwell's death, he had such knowledge of German that he was at once admitted to the benefice of Bergzabern, where he preached till the death of Henry VIII.

² State Papers, vol. I, p. 383.

³ When he went abroad after

had promised them such a gift, and by the rapid circulation of Tyndale's Testament, the suppression of which was sternly commanded. The people were longing for the Scriptures in the mother tongue; and while their longings were recognized, they were virtually set at nought. The decision of the council, which, after a conference of twelve days, began by fulminating against Tyndale's Testament, was formally embodied in a royal proclamation, and Warham, the Primate, immediately followed with another document, which ended with a bill to be read by preachers, and to the following effect:—

"Forasmuch that it was reported unto the king's highnes, that there is engendered an opynyon in diverse of his subjects, that it is his duetie to cawse the Scripture of God to be translated into the Englishe tonge to be communicate unto the people; & that the prelates & also his highnes doo wronge in denying or letting of the same; his highnes therefor willed every man there present in the said assemble, freely and frankly to shewe & open unto him what might be proved and confirmed by Scripture & holy doctours in that behalf, to the entent that his highnes, as he there openly protested, myght conforme himself thereunto, mynding to doo his dutie towards his people, as he wolde they shulde doo their duties towards him. In whiche matter, after Scriptures declared, holy doctours & auctors alleged, & read, & all thinges sayde that might be on both sidys, & for bothe parties spoken, deduced, & brought furthe; fynally it appered, that the having of the hole Scripture in Englysshe is not necessarye to cristen men, but that without having any suche Scripture endeavoring themselves to doo well, & to applye their myndes to take and followe such leassons as the precher techith theym, & soo lerned by his mowthe, may as well edifye spiritually in their soules, as if they had the same Scripture in Englishe; & like as the having of Scripture in the vulgar tongis, & in the common peoples handes, hath ben by holy fathers of the church heretofore in some tymes thought mete and convenient; soo at another tyme it hath ben thought to holy fathers not expedient to be communicate amongst them.

Wherein forasmuche as the kings highnes, by the advise &

deliberation of his counceill, & the agrement of great learned men, thinkith in his conscience that the divulging of this Scripture at this tyme in Englysshe tonge to be committed to the people, considering such pestilente books & so evill opynions as be now spred amonge them, shulde rather be to their further confusion & destruction then the edification of their soules; & that as holy doctours testifie upon suche like considerations, the semblable hath been doon in tymes past, it was thought ther in that assemble to all & singuler in that congregation, that the kings highnes & the prelates in soo dooing, not suffering the Scripture to be divulgid & communicate in the Englyshe tonge unto the people at this tyme, doth well, & (the preacher was to add) I also think & judge the same, exhorting and moving you, that in consideration his highnes did there openlye saye & protest, that he wolde cause the Newe Testament to be by lerned men faithfully & purely translated into Englyshe tonge, to the extent he might have it in his handes redy to be gevyn to his people, as he might se their manners & behaviour mete, apte, and convenient to receyve the same, that ye will soo detest thes perniciousse boks, so abhorre thes heresies & newe opynions, soo declyne from arrogancy of knowledge & understanding of Scripture after your fantasies, and shewe your self in the meane tyme without grudging or murmeryng, perswading unto your selfe the very truth, which is this, that ye cannot require or demande Scripture to be divulged in the Englyshe tonge, otherwise then upon the discretions of the superiours, soo as whensoever they think in their conscience it may doo yowe good, they may & doo well to geve it unto you, and whensoever it shall be seen otherwise unto them, they do amisse in suffering you to have it."

The king's implied promise to authorize an English Bible was too precious to be forgotten, and Latimer took an early opportunity of briskly refreshing the royal memory. On the 1st of December, 1530, he sent an epistle to his Majesty of marvellous boldness, fidelity, and earnestness. Several manuscript copies of it are still in existence, showing that it must have had some circulation. The undaunted reformer thus proceeds, without hesitation:—

"How little do they fear the terrible judgment of Almighty God! And specially they which boast themselves to be guides and captains unto others, and challenge unto themselves the knowledge of holy Scripture, yet will neither show the truth themselves (as they be bound), neither suffer them that would. . . . And they will, as much as in them lieth, debar, not only the Word of God, which David calleth 'a light to direct,' and show every man how to order his affections and lusts according to the commandments of God, but also by their subtile wiliness they instruct, move, and provoke in a manner all kings in Christendom, to aid, succour, and help them in this their mischief. And especially in this your realm they have so blinded your liege people and subjects with their laws, customs, ceremonies, and barbarous glosses, and punished them with cursings, excommunications, and other corruptions (corrections I would say). And now, at the last, when they see that they cannot prevail against the open truth (which the more it is persecuted, the more it increaseth by their tyranny) they have made it treason to your noble Grace to have the Scripture in English.

"This, most gracious King, when I considered, and also your favourable and gentle nature, I was bold to write this rude, homely, and simple letter unto your Grace, trusting that you will accept my true and faithful mind even as it is.

"Your Grace may see what means and craft the spirituality (as they will be called) imagine, to break and withstand the Acts which were made in your Grace's last Parliament against their superfluities. Wherefore they that thus do, your Grace may know them not to be true followers of Christ. And though I named the spirituality to be corrupt with this unchristian ambition, yet I mean not all to be faulty therein, for there be some good of them; neither would I that your Grace should take away the goods due to the Church, but take away all evil persons from the goods, and set better in their stead.

"And they whose works be naught, dare not come to this light, but go about to stop it and hinder it, letting as much as they may that the Holy Scriptures should not be read in our mother tongue, saying that it would cause heresy and insurrection; and so they persuade, at the least way they would fain persuade, your Grace to keep it back. . . . But as concerning this matter, other men have showed your Grace their minds, how necessary it is to have the Scripture in English. The which thing also your Grace hath promised by your last procla-

mation: the which promise I pray God that your gracious Highness may shortly perform, even to-day, before to-morrow. Nor let the wickedness of these worldly men detain you from your godly purpose and promise.

"As concerning your last proclamation, prohibiting such books, the very true cause of it and chief counsellors were they, whose evil living and cloaked hypocrisy these books uttered and disclosed. And, howbeit, that there were three or four that would have had the Scripture to go forth in English, yet it happened there, as it is evermore seen, that the most part overcometh the better. And so it might be that these men did not take this proclamation as yours, but as theirs, set forth in your name, as they have done many times before, which hath put your realm in great hinderance and trouble, and brought it in great penury. But what marvel is it that they, being so nigh of your counsel and so familiar with your lords, should provoke both your Grace and them to prohibit these books, which before, by their own authority, have forbidden the New Testament under pain of everlasting damnation? For such is their manner, to send a thousand men to hell ere they send one to God.

"And take heed whose counsels your Grace doth take in this matter, that you may do that God commandeth, and not that seemeth good in your own sight without the Word of God; that your Grace may be found acceptable in His sight, and one of the members of His Church; and, according to the office that He hath called your Grace unto, you may be found a faithful minister of His gifts, and not a defender of His faith: for He will not have it defended by man or man's power, but by His Word only, by the which He hath evermore defended it, and that by a way far above man's power, or reason, as all the stories of the Bible make mention.

"Wherefore, gracious King, remember yourself; have pity upon your soul; and think that the day is even at hand when you shall give account of your office, and of the blood that hath been shed with your sword. . . . The Spirit of God preserve your Grace!"

Coverdale may, therefore, have been the more anxious to hasten on the work, for change of opinion had been rapidly spreading in England. The authority of the Italian Pontiff had also been broken, when, by the Convocation of 1531, Henry was acknowledged as supreme head of the Church, and the

papal jurisdiction was superseded by the royal prerogative, or rather was absorbed into it.¹ The desire for the Scriptures in English could not be repressed, the few copies in circulation created a desire for more. Convocation, or rather the bishops, abbots, and friars of the Upper House of the Province of Canterbury, which met on the 19th of December, 1534, "did unanimously consent that the most reverend father the Archbishop make instance in their names to the king, that his majesty would vouchsafe for the increase of the faith of his subjects, to decree and command that all his subjects in whose possession any books of suspect doctrine were, especially in the vulgar language, imprinted beyond or on this side the sea, should be warned within three months to bring those in before persons to be appointed by the king, under a certain pain to be limited by the king; and that, moreover, his Majesty would vouchsafe to decree that the sacred Scriptures should be translated into the English tongue by certain honest and learned men, named for that purpose by his Majesty, and should be delivered to the people according to their learning."² The last portion of the memorial was bitterly opposed by Gardynier and his party, for they maintained that all "heresies and extravagancies sprang from the free use of the Scriptures." The Convocation itself, apparently, did not feel its ground to be very secure; for while it ventured on one bold step—to ask for a translation of Scripture—it attempted to guard its decision against apprehended abuses, and forbade such inquiries and discussions as the free circulation of the English Bible at that time must certainly produce. It prohibited the subjects from "publicly disputing, or in any manner contending, concerning the Catholic faith, or the articles of faith, or the sacred Scripture, or its meaning." The attempt was vain, for discussions could not but spring up in the divided state of religious opinion. The old and the new had come into sharp conflict, and the new, suddenly conscious of its strength, was tempted

¹ The title, Defender of the Faith, against the Lollards—*nos zelo fidei* of which Henry was so proud, had *Catholicæ cuius sumus et esse volumus Defensores*.

II in a royal commission granted ² Wilkin's *Concilia*, vol. III, p. 770.

to exhibit and test it unduly, like the lame man healed by the apostle, who, not content with the common exercise of restored physical power, is described as "leaping" in wanton thankfulness while he entered into the temple "praising God." The result of this petition of Convocation is not definitely known, and probably it was not presented in form to the king. But the archbishop, to seize the opportunity, at once set about the work himself. The story told by Strype is to the following effect, that the primate was determined "that a translation of the Bible should be published, and that the way he managed was this—He took an [old]¹ translation of the New Testament (Tyndale's) to begin with. This he divided into nine or ten parts, causing each part to be written at large in a paper book, and then to be sent to the best learned bishops and others, to the intent that they should make a perfect correction thereof; and when they had done so, to restore them to him at Lambeth by a certain time. One of these parts (the Acts of the Apostles) was, it seems, sent to Stokesley, Bishop of London. When the day fixed was come, they all sent in their portions to the archbishop except Stokesley; and the archbishop, sending to know why he had not sent in his part like the rest, Stokesley returned the following answer: "I marvel what my Lord of Canterbury meaneth, that thus abuseth the people, in giving them liberty to read the Scriptures, which doth nothing else but infect them with heresy. I have bestowed never an hour upon my portion, nor never will; and, therefore, my lord shall have this book again, for I will never be guilty of bringing the common people into error." Mr. Thomas Lawney,² chaplain to the old Duke of Norfolk, standing by and hearing the arch-

¹ In Foxe's MSS., to which Strype formally refers as his only authority, the word "old" does not occur. But the "Injunctions" of 1536 given in Foxe, "that every parson or proprietary of any parish church was to provide a whole Bible in Latin and also in English before the first of August, to be laid in the choir," are not found in Cranmer's Register, nor

in Wilkin's. Foxe may have got the clause from some inexact or uncorrected scroll, but the injunctions ascribed to Crumwell were apparently never published.

² Lawney had been one of the scholars chosen by Wolsey for his College at Oxford, and had been imprisoned in 1528.

bishop speak of Stokesley's untowardness, said, "I can tell your grace why my Lord of London will not bestow any labour or pains this way: your grace knoweth well that his portion is a piece of the New Testament. But he being persuaded that Christ had not bequeathed him anything in his Testament, thought it were madness to bestow any labour or pains where no gain was to be gotten. And besides this, it is the Acts of the Apostles, which were simple poor fellows, and therefore my Lord of London disdained to have to do with any of them."¹ The scheme seems to have miscarried for some reason, though, according to Morrice, Cranmer's private secretary, "every man sent to Lambeth their parts corrected,"² but the purposed edition never appeared.

Cranmer's project of getting a version made through episcopal co-operation has been frequently ascribed to the influence of the Convocation of 1536. But the opinion is erroneous, for, on the 1st of June, 1535, Bishop Gardyner, writing from Waltham, informs Crumwell, "I have finished the translations of St. Luke and St. John, wherein I bestowed great labour, though I had as great cause as any man to desire rest and quiet for the health of my body."³ Bishop Gardyner seems to have been lying under some cloud of political suspicions at the time. He "laments and wails his chance and fortune," the king fearing in "me a coloured doubleness," and refers to something alleged to have been done by him in the house of Syon, a house notorious for its opposition to the divorce, the supremacy, and all change. And therefore he sent the notice of his completed revision, not to the primate, as the other revisers did, but to the powerful Secretary.

These things were not "done in a corner," and they must have been known to Coverdale's patrons, who were prompting him to redeem the time. During this period he had not been idle, and some patient and industrious months must have been given to the labour. It must have commenced before the

¹ Strype's Life of Cranmer, vol. I, p. 71, Oxford, 1848.

³ The holograph letter is preserved in the Crumwell Correspondence,

² Nicholl's Narrative, Camden bundle W, State Papers, I, 430. Soc. ed., p. 277.

petition of Convocation, for from that date less than a year elapsed before the Bible was published. The volume could not have been prepared during this brief interval, for on such a supposition which one writer has adopted, there must have been, in no figurative sense, "an invisible power guiding the thoughts and speeding the pen of the translator."¹ Apparently none but his immediate friends and advisers were aware of his doings or divined his intentions. He had retired into temporary seclusion, and a friendly cloud concealed him. As the harvest springs from seed which germinates in darkness, so the entire English Bible, translated no one knows where, presented itself unheralded and unanticipated at once to national notice in 1535.

The previous months and years had been very eventful. The treasonable utterances of the nun of Kent had brought her and her accomplices to Tyburn. Some seditious monks of the Charterhouse had been remorselessly executed "in their habits"; and the king, as if touched by such scenes of blood, had ordered his court into mourning. Wolsey had passed into eclipse and death; Fisher and More had fallen; the heart of popish Europe was filled with indignation and bitterness, and there had been symptoms of a continental coalition against Henry. The reports of the indescribable vices and villanies of some of the religious houses were beginning to be known and talked of; many momentous ecclesiastical changes had taken place, and more seemed to be impending, for the Pope had been transubstantiated into the king; Cranmer was in Canterbury, and Anne Boleyn on the throne; and the pre-occupied and distracted people of England had no leisure to give the new Bible any formal token of recognition or welcome.

The title-page of the volume that had stolen as a stranger into the country names itself thus:—"Biblia—The Bible: that is, the Holy Scripture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully & truly translated out of Douche & Latyn

¹ In a letter to Conrad Hubert, sometimes in need of a spur, inasdated Bergzabern, February 20th, much as I am by nature dilatory." 1545, Coverdale confesses, "I am

in to Englishe, MDXXXV. S. Paul, ii Tessa iii. Praye for us, that the worde of God maie have fre passage, & be glorified, &c. S. Paul, Colloss. iii. Let the worde of Christ dwell in you plenteously in all wysdome, &c. Josue i, Let not the Boke of this lawe departe out of thy mouth, but exercyse thyselfe therein daye & nyghte, &c." Then follows a Dedication: "Vnto the most victorious Prynce & oure most gracyous soueraigne Lorde, kynge Henry the eyght, kynge of Englonde & of Fraunce, lorde of Irelande, &c., Defendour of the Fayth, & vnder God the chefe & suppreme heade of the Church of Englonde;" followed by a prayer that among other blessings "multiplication of seed which God gave unto Abraham and Sara, his wife, be given unto you, most gracious prince, with your dearest just wife and most virtuous princess, Queen Anne." "Queen Anne," however, was soon changed into "Queen Jane." The Dedication fills five pages, and is signed on the last of them, "Your graces humble subiecte & daylye oratour, Myles Coverdale." It contains eloquent denunciations of Popery, and is exuberant in its laudation of the king. It pictures "the blynde bysshope of Rome" as Balaam and Caiaphas, and the king as a Moses, a David, a Jehoshaphat, a Hezekiah, "yea, as a very good Josiah," revived in his Majesty. He stoutly upholds, also, the pre-eminence of the temporal sword, and vindicates the sole royal supremacy, there being above the king "no other head under God." It also touches on themes most pleasing to him, probably including a favourable reference to the king's "great business," the divorce, "as John durst say unto King Herode, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife." The cases were not at all similar, indeed, for Herod's brother was alive when the Baptist pronounced the censure; but the verse was often quoted in the great controversy, which was discussed by statesmen, casuists, and divines in so many courts and colleges of Europe. Nor was it a divorce in the common sense of the term, but the dissolution of a union which, according to the king's friends and lawyers, had been void from the beginning, as it had never been a valid marriage. The Dedication is followed by "A prologe" of five pages and a half, which briefly discusses

the question of translation, enumerates and characterizes the various books of the Bible, and is followed by a catalogue of them. The lower half of the last page of the volume contains "A faute escaped in pryntinge the New Testament," and two similar errors are noted at the end of the Song of Solomon. The colophon is "prynted in the yere of oure Lorde MDXXXV, and fynished the fourthe daye of October." The volume, small folio, is printed in angular black letter, in double columns, and a full page contains fifty-seven lines. It consists of six parts: "The first, Genesis to Deuteronomion; the seconde, Joshua to Hester; the thyrde, Job to Solomon's Song; the fourth, the Prophets; the fifth, the Apocrypha; and the sixth is the New Testament. The Table of Contents fills two pages, and is headed with The Bokes of the hole Byble, how they are named in Englysh and Latyn, how longe they are written in the Allegacions, and how many chapters every Boke hath. The contents of the chapters are placed before each book, with the exception of Salomon's Ballettes and the Lamentacions of Jeremy. The same exception holds in the Apocrypha in the case of the Songe of Three Children, the Story of Susanna, and the Story of Bel; but "contents" are placed before each chapter of the Apocryphal Esther. There are no verses, but paragraphs are marked and distinguished by capital letters on the margin. There are numerous woodcuts in the text, the half of the first page of Genesis representing six "dayes worke," and there are many ornamented capitals. At the end of Deuteronomy there is a map of the size of two leaves—curiously constructed with the north to the bottom and the south to the top, and headed, "The descripcion of the lande of promes called Palestina, Canaan, or the holy lande."

The Apocrypha has this brief preface—"The Bokes & Treatises which among the Fathers of olde are not rekened to be of like authoritie with the other Bokes of the Byble, nether are they founde in the Canon of the Hebrue"—with a note at the foot of the page, "Unto these also belongeth Baruc, whom we haue set amonge the prophetes next unto Jeremy, because he was his scribe, & in his tyme." The next page has "The

Translatoure unto the Reader"—"These bokes (good reader) which be called Apocrypha, are not iudged amonge the doctours to be of like reputacion with the other scripture, as thou mayest perceaue by S. Jerome in epistola ad Paulinum; & the chefe cause thereof is this: there be many places in them that seme to be repugnaunt vnto the open & manyfest trueth in the other bokes of the byble. Nevertheles, I have not gathered them together to the intent that I wolde haue them despysed, or little sett by, or that I shulde thinke them false, for I am not able to proue it: Yee, I doute not verely, yf they were equally conferred with the other open scripture (tyme, place, & circumstance in all thinges considered) they shulde nether seme contrary, ner be vntruly & peruersly alledged. Treuth it is: a man's face can not be sene so wel in a water, as in a fayre glasse; nether can it be shewed so clearly in a water that is stered or moued, as in a styll water. These & many other darck places of scripture haue bene sore stered & myxte with blynde & cuvetous opynions of men which haue cast soche a myst afore the eyes of the symple that as longe as they be not conferred with the other places of scripture, they shall not seme other wyse to be vnderstonde, then as cuvetousnes expoundeth them. But who so euer thou be that readest scripture, let the holy goost by thy teacher, & let one text expounde another vnto the: As for soch dreames, visions, & darck sentences as be hyd from thy vnderstandinge, commytte them vnto God, and make no articles of them: But let the playne text be thy gyde, and the sprete of God (which is the author therof) shal lede the in all trueth.

"As for the prayer of Salomon (which thou findest not herin), the prayer of Azarias, & the swete songe that he & his two felowes songe in the fyre: the first (namely, the prayer of Salomon) readest thou in the eight chapter of the thirde boke of the kynges, so that it appeareth not to be Apocryphum: The other prayer & songe (namely, of the thre children) haue I not founde amonge eny of the interpreters, but onely in the olde latyn texte, which reporteth it to be of Theodotio's translacion. Nevertheles, both because of those that be weake & scrupulous, & for their sakes also that love soch swete songes

of thankesgeunge: I haue not left them out: to the intent that the one shulde haue no cause to complayne, & that the other also might haue the more occasion to geue thankes vnto God in aduersite, as the thre children dyd in the fyre. Grace be with the. Amen." The prayer of Manasses is left out, as the Zürich Bible had omitted it; but before the canonical Lamentations is set this preface, "And it came to passe (after Israel was brought into captivitie & Jerusalem destroyed) that Jeremy the prophet sat weepyng & mourning, & making his mone (moan) in Jerusalem, so that with an heavy herte he sighed & sobbed, sayenge."

The Bible has no name of place or printer, and neither place nor printer is ascertained to perfect satisfaction. It is sometimes supposed to have been printed by Christian Egenolph, at Frankfort.¹ The evidence is based on the similarity between some woodcuts bearing the monogram of Hans Sebald Beham of Nuremberg used by Egenolph, and those found in Coverdale; but an examination shows at once that they are not the same, those in Coverdale being only copies. The type in Egenolph's German Bible is not the same in body with that used in Coverdale. Offor puts in a plea for Cologne as the place of printing; but there is a very strong presumption that Froschover of Zürich, who printed the edition of 1550, also printed that of 1535. The two larger sizes of letters in the Bible are found in his other works; but the watermarks in the leaves of these works differ from those found in the Bible. Froschover was at a later day the friend and protector of the Marian exiles, and boarded twelve of them, including Humphrey, Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and Bishop Parkhurst. Several letters of his, dated Oxford, are found in the collection published by the Parker Society.² He is also spoken of by Grindal³ as "rich enough," and therefore fitted to take on him the charge of an expensive work. He printed Cranmer's book against Gardyner, John Foxe delivering the copy to him. He was, in short, in position and character,

¹ As by Botfield, *Miscellanies*, &c., p. 43, ² Remains of Archbishop Grindal, p. 220, Parker Soc. ed.

³ Original Letters, vol. II, p. 719.

such a man as might be entrusted with a work to be done in secret, and involving probably a considerable outlay. Besides, as Coverdale's version rests mainly on the Swiss-German Bible, printed by Froschover, in Zürich, we may infer that the translator's retreat had been for a period in that city, and from typographical evidence that his translation was completed and printed there.¹

The year 1535 was, in one sense, a year of promise. Tyndale was in prison indeed; but Coverdale's Bible was published, and there were also issued these royal injunctions for the University of Cambridge, indicating the dawn of a new era. "In each college and hall there shall be two daily public lectures, one of Greek, the other of Latin. . . . No lectures shall be read upon any of the doctors who have written upon the Master of the Sentences, but all divinity lectures shall be upon the Scriptures."

¹ The Bible by Coverdale, 1535. By Francis Fry, F.S.A., Lond. 1867.

CHAPTER XVIII.

SOME peculiar points in the history of this volume may be noted. It has two distinct title-pages, one in the type of the volume, and therefore the original one; the other in the English black letter of the period, and therefore a reprinted one, with dates of 1535 and 1536. There are also two copies with a facsimile of the title of 1535, but with a very important clause left out, while the leaves that come after are in English type. These reprints give the list of Books on the reverse of the seventh leaf—the first title has it on its own reverse. The name of Queen Anne is found in some copies, and the name of Queen Jane in others. Various surmises have been thrown out as to the causes of this early reprint of the preliminary furniture. It has been sometimes argued, as by Lewis,¹ Botfield,² Walter,³ and Anderson,⁴ that, after the volume had been printed, its publication was postponed on account of the trial and execution of Queen Anne who was beheaded 19th May, 1536. Her name had been in the original dedication, and it was now thought necessary to expunge it. Eight months must in this way be supposed to elapse between the period when the volume was finished, in October, 1535, and its issue in England with Queen Jane in the dedication, 1536. To support this conjecture stress is laid on the copy in the British Museum, in which "Anne" has been made into "Jane" with a pen; but any possessor of a copy might, if he pleased, effect such a change, and no argument can be based upon it, unless it be supposed that the awkward alteration was introduced into the

¹ History, p. 100, London, 1818.

³ Letter to Herbert Marsh, p. 73.

² Cathedral Libraries, p. 193.

⁴ Annals, I, p. 563.

whole edition. The copy at Sion College has Jane printed as part of the original text, and with the date 1536. But the title, as Mr. Fry¹ plainly shows from difference of type and from the misprints, belongs to the edition printed by Nycolson in 1537, and by a common trick it was put into an earlier issue, as if to produce a complete copy. In fact, all the "Jane" leaves are from the same edition, the English reprint. All the known copies that have the dedication to King Henry VIII, of date 1535 and 1536, read Queen Anne. There is therefore little doubt that the Bible was issued in 1535, with a title-page and preliminary matter in the same foreign type as the body or text of the volume. The editions found with the title and following leaves in English black letter, bearing the date both of 1535 and 1536, only show that the first title and prefatory matter had been on purpose superseded, and that very soon after the arrival of the Bible in this country. The reasons of the change in the title-page itself will be afterwards discussed.

Some interesting particulars about this first complete English Bible may be gleaned from itself, and from Coverdale's dedication of his edition of 1550.

And, *first*, true to his temperament, he was not the originator; but is ever forward to make and repeat this acknowledgment: "To say the truth before God, it was neither my labour nor desire to have this work put into my hand, nevertheless, when I was instantly required, though I could not do so well as I would, I thought it yet my duty to do my best, and that with a good will, for the which cause (according as I was desired), anno 1534, I took the more upon me to set forth² this special translation;" and he adds, "I was boldened in God sixteen years ago to labour faithfully in the same." What is more striking, the use of the Douche and Latin versions had been prescribed to him, his singular words about his predecessors being, "whom I have been the more glad to follow, according as

¹ The Bible by Coverdale, p. 17, phrase for publishing. The edition &c., London, 1867.

² "Set forth" was Coverdale's kynge's most gracious license."

I was required." In his first dedication his utterance also is, "Trusting in His infinite goodness, that He would bring my simple and rude labour herein to good effect, therefore, as the Holy Ghost moved other men to do the cost hereof, so was I boldened in God to labour in the same." The persons so referred to are unknown. For prudential reasons their names were not divulged, and probably they did not covet the perilous notoriety. There must have been within the church a party of covert inquirers who might encourage a translation of the Bible as the charter of ecclesiastical liberty and reform. Crumwell, who became Secretary of State in 1534, had been Coverdale's tutelary genius, had directed his studies, and had certainly befriended him in this undertaking. Probably others like-minded, feeling that Tyndale and his work had been proscribed by name, and "all manner of evil" said against them, may have also urged him on, and sympathized with him in his literary labour. It may even be believed that Sir Thomas More knew of the translation, and of its earlier progress. In the letter first quoted,¹ Coverdale speaks of "Master Moore's kinsman being ill at ease under fever," and in the second he adverts to a conversation held in his house on Easter Eve, which shows that there must have been some degree of intimacy between him and the Chancellor. More did not wholly oppose translations in theory, but objected to Tyndale's so strongly because it wanted several ecclesiastical terms. Tyndale's Testament had been condemned already, and the higher powers could not be expected to retract their sentence; so that if there was to be an English Bible, it must emanate from a new and untainted source. What would not be tolerated as coming from Tyndale, might be accepted as coming from Coverdale, whose name was new and who had few palpable and compromising antecedents.

But Mr. Froude outsteps all probability when he represents the king as in some way originating this version, and as acting on his own responsibility, "his patience being exhausted" in expectation of providing a Bible for his

¹ See page 256.

subjects.¹ Henry, however, had no hand in the production of the volume, though it was dedicated to him. The dedication, indeed, declares that "Josias commanded straitly (as youre grace doth) that the lawe of God shulde be redde and taught vnto all the people." But the reference is to the royal proclamation, of which Latimer reminded the king in a letter dated 1st December, 1530, written after a meeting of Convocation.² At the close of 1534, Convocation indeed, as we have seen, petitioned the king for an English translation of the Scriptures, but there is no proof that the petition was laid before him; and if he received it, he certainly took no action upon it. Nor had the first issue of Coverdale's version exposed for sale the words "cum privilegio" on its front, as the historian wrongly asserts. The original title-pages contain no clause of this nature, for "the king's most gracious license" first appeared on the edition printed at Southwark in 1537. Mr. Froude also adduces the frontispiece in proof of his statements, "it being equally remarkable and more emphatic in the recognition of the share in the work done by the king." The eloquent annalist makes here an unaccountable mistake, for the frontispiece described by him, "the Almighty in the clouds, and Cranmer, and Crumwell, in prominent positions on each side," &c., is that of the Great Bible of 1539, and not that of Coverdale at all. Coverdale's is modest in comparison: at the base the king occupies the centre, the royal arms under him, and a square space filled with the title of the Bible over his head, his sword in his one hand, and in his other hand a volume which the bishops are presenting to him, while the peers are looking on; St. Paul is at the one corner with the scroll, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel"; and King David, harp in hand, at the other, with the scroll, "O how sweete are thy wordes to my throte"; at the top are the Hebrew letters representing Jehovah; on the one side are the first transgressors ashamed of their nakedness, and the serpent coiled over their head, with a scroll, "In what daye soever thou eatest thereof thou shalt dye"; on the other side is the Saviour crushing with his heel the serpent's head, with the scroll, "This is my deare Sonne,

¹ History, III, p. 79.

² See page 261.

in whom I delyte, hear him." This frontispiece of Coverdale is a cheap and worthless woodcut, poor in conception and inartistic in execution, and, therefore, very unlike the spirited and fine engraving by Hans Holbein in the Great Bible, with which Mr. Froude confounds it, and which will be described in its place. The other six engravings on both sides of the title are only simple scenes from the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, and the New Testament. There is, therefore, no proof whatever that the king knew of or was concerned at all in the origination of Coverdale's Bible. Nor would the translator have concealed the royal patronage—it was not his habit to pass over in silence so great an honour.

Secondly, Though Coverdale was not the originator of the enterprise, he claims to be the one workman. Thus in his address to the Christian Reader, " . . . I was the more bold to take it in hand. . . . I took the more upon me to set forth this special translation. . . . Though it be not worthily ministered unto thee by reason of my rudeness, I thought it my duty to do my best, and that with a good will. . . . I pray God that through my poor ministrations herein, I may give them that can do better some occasion so to do. . . . Whereinsoever I can perceive by myself, or by the information of others, that I have failed, I shall now by the help of God overlook it better and amend it." To the king his avowal is, "I thought it my duty when I had translated the Bible to dedicate this translation unto your highness." He therefore did the work as sole translator, any assistance in comparison of texts or in carrying the volume through the press being of a subordinate nature. But this distinct claim of sole authorship, so formally and frequently asserted and reiterated in the plainest terms, has not been always accepted, and it has been sometimes put aside by unsupported conjectures. Whittaker, against all proof, alleges that Coverdale's Bible "is properly regarded as the joint production of Tyndale and Coverdale," and subjoins what is beyond all belief, "Coverdale, assisted by Rogers, who corrected the press, revised the whole of Tyndale's work before they printed it,"¹ the statement being

¹ Historical and Critical Enquiry, p. 48.

a bewildered reference to the Bible of 1537, or the Great Bible of 1539. Tyndale would not have coveted such a partnership, and could not have tolerated many of Coverdale's renderings. Blunt speaks in unintelligible terms of Coverdale's Bible, "as being printed abroad from the translation in which Tyndale, Coverdale, and Rogers had each a share," and subjoins a note, "It is almost impossible to distinguish their respective shares."¹ True, for no one can distinguish among non-existent things, and the mistake, if it be not a mere repetition of the errors of previous authorities, has arisen from some unconscious confusion of thought about Matthew's Bible, which, however, is immediately afterwards mentioned. Macknight's allegations are yet wilder and blinder when he ventures to charge Coverdale with something like fraud, since, by calling his version "a special translation,"² he wished to have it considered as different from Tyndale's—a mistake probably originating in the erroneous notion that Matthew's Bible was merely a second edition of Coverdale's. Even Hallam, led astray by Johnson, or "other authorities," whom yet he has stigmatized as "erroneous or defective," describes this translation as "a complete version of the Bible, partly by Tyndale and partly by Coverdale."³ Froude also falls into more elaborate error on the same subject. As if he were inserting a statement which rested on indisputable testimony, he quietly avers, "Miles Coverdale went abroad; with Tyndale's help he collected and edited the scattered portions," that is, of the Old and New Testament. But there really existed no such "scattered portions," for Tyndale had only published a version of the Pentateuch and of Jonah. Besides, Coverdale did not republish in his Bible any part of Tyndale. His is really a new version of the Old Testament, and a revised version of the New; and Tyndale, so far as is known, had and could have no participation in the work. Blundering onward, and yet more deeply, Mr. Froude next asserts that this Bible "was made up of parts prohibited in

¹ The Reformation of the Church of England, p. 510.

³ Constitutional History of England, vol. I, p. 83.

² A new literal translation of the Epistles, vol. I, p. 15.

detail"; but the assertion applies to Matthew's, and not in any sense whatever to Coverdale's Bible. He says, moreover, that "Tyndale had translated the New Testament, the Pentateuch, and the Historical Books," and the statement is true; but he adds what all evidence contradicts, "afterwards by Tyndale himself, or under Tyndale's eyes, the Psalms and the Prophets were rendered."¹ But any one looking into the versions may ascertain the truth for himself. Coverdale, beyond all doubt, was the translator of the Old Testament after 2 Chronicles, and his translation was accepted by Rogers or Matthew in his Bible of 1537, which also contains all that Tyndale had completed. To Coverdale himself, therefore, and to no copartnership of any kind, is the Bible of 1535 to be ascribed. He claims to be the one doer, and no one who knows his transparency of character can doubt his simple word.

Thirdly, Coverdale does not profess to follow any settled principles of translation. The prologue to the Christian Reader does not formally enter upon the subject. He knew, however, that an interpreter ought to have "excellent knowledge and learning in the tongues," and he avows his perfect integrity: "so make I this protestation, having God to record in my conscience, that I have neither wrested nor altered so much as one word for the maintenance of any manner of sect, but have with a clear conscience purely and faithfully translated . . . though I have failed anywhere (as there is no man but he misseth in some thing) love shall construe all to the best, without any perverse judgment. There is no man living that can see all things, neither hath God given any man to know everything. Howbeit, whereinsoever I can perceive by myself, or by the information of other, that I have failed (as it is no wonder), I shall now by the help of God overlook it better and amend it." He urges also the value of translations: "Now whereas the most famous interpreters of all give sundry judgments of the text, so far as it is done by the spirit of knowledge in the Holy Ghost, methink no man should be offended thereat, for they refer their doings in meekness to the spirit of truth in the congregation of God; and sure I am that there cometh more

¹ History, vol. III, pp. 79, 80.

knowledge and understanding of the Scripture by their sundry translations than by all the glosses of our sophistical doctors. For that one interpreteth something obscurely in one place, the same translateth another; or else he himself, more manifestly by a more plain vocable of the same meaning, in another place. Be not thou offended therefore, good reader, though one call a scribe that another calleth a lawyer; or elders, that another calleth father and mother; or repentance, that another calleth penance or amendment. For if thou be not deceived by men's traditions, thou shalt find no more diversity between these terms than between fourpence and a groat."¹ This license however, he carried too far, as did Tyndale; and both set a bad example to subsequent revisers. But he keeps fast the terms "scribe" and "congregation" in the New Testament, and though he does use "repentance" very often, he sometimes varies it by "penance" and "amendment." Coverdale has some eloquent eulogies on the character and benefits of Scripture, and some excellent practical counsels as to the profitable and spiritual reading of it.

Lastly, Though Coverdale began, and carried out the work without co-operation, he never exalts his version as one taken immediately from the Hebrew and Greek text. He was too honest to put forward any false pretences, and he felt that any boastful falsehoods were in utter antagonism to the book on which he had been so silently and patiently working. He would not give a Bible to the people with a lie in the right hand that was holding it out to them. The original title-page revealed the truth, "faythfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn." This curt declaration expresses the simple fact without hesitation or abatement. But as if this honest confession on the title-page, explained and confirmed as it was in the prologue and dedication, had been either too

¹ Grosseteste (Greathead), Bishop of the Church, so that what is obscurely London, who died in 1253, had said, expressed by one may be more perspicuously rendered by another." "It is the will of God that the Holy Scriptures should be translated by Wharton, Auct. Hist. Dogmat., p. many translators, and that there 416. should be different translations in

startling or were liable to be misunderstood, a significant change was soon made, and the phrase, "out of Douche and Latyn"¹ was omitted. The omission is found in the title of one copy printed in English black letter, and dated 1535, which has simply "faythfully translated in to Englyshe," and so in another of 1536; but in the edition of 1537, which issued from the press of Nycolson, the words are "translated in Englysh," and "Douche and Latyn" were dropped not only out of the editions referred to, but also out of all subsequent issues. Mr. Fry suggests that, as Froschover, who probably was the printer, has made blunders on the title-pages of some of his English Bibles, as in the quarto edition of Coverdale, 1550, and in Tyndale's New Testament of the same date, so the words "out of Douche and Latyn" may in this way have really been an unauthorized declaration. But the conjecture is not very probable, for the deleted words present the exact case. Yet Whittaker, who by his own confession had never seen the original title, hazards the assertion that, "if this be the case, the title-page contains a very great misrepresentation."² The editor of Bagster's reprint of Coverdale calls the change of title a bookselling artifice of the time, to make the work circulate better, and Anderson conjectures that the new title was a mere device, as if it were a different book.³ The more probable reason is that some of the persons who suggested the work or favoured it, or defrayed the expense, may have been displeased at the candour of the title-page, and counselled its alteration—"Douche" or German being regarded as in special alliance with heresy and deeply tainted with it. But whatever the motive for changing the title, the change was unfair to Coverdale. If done without his sanction, it was a great injustice to him; and if he was overborne by stronger minds to consent to it, as Anderson insinuates, it was a weakness which cannot be

¹ Douche meant what is now p. 59. He means that Coverdale translated directly from the German or Dutch. original texts.

² Historical and Critical Enquiry, ³ Annals, vol. I, p. 563.

excused. He should have been true to himself and to his first purpose, resolved to hold by the naked verity as stated in this first title-page and in his Prologue. One may, however, believe that he intended his Bible to circulate as it came from Froschover's press, and with an unmutilated title to carry its own tale. At the same time, it is strange that the parties who concealed what Coverdale was so forward to tell, should have left untouched the Prologue and Dedication which give so distinctly and formally his own account of the sources of his translation. For the words of the first title which the Bible bore on its arrival in London are explicitly confirmed by the disclosure which Coverdale makes to the king: "I have with a clear conscience purely and faithfully translated this out of five sundry interpreters, having only the manifest truth of the Scriptures before mine eyes;" and by what he says to the Christian reader: "To help me herein, I have had sondrye translacions, not only in Latyn,' but also of the Douche interpreters, whom, because of their singuler gyftes and special diligence in the Bible, I have been the more glad to follow for the most part."¹ This confession is so very plain and full, that it must be taken in its literal significance; for the fact is, that he took his Bible at once from the German and Latin versions, especially the Old Testament, without any regard whatever to the Hebrew text, with which he had no familiar acquaintance, if indeed he had any acquaintance at all. Four of these "five interpreters," whom, however, he does not specify, were the Vulgate, Luther, the Zürich or Swiss-German Bible, the Latin version of Pagninus, and he certainly consulted Tyndale's Pentateuch and New Testament.²

¹ Alexander Barclay had already then translated into Latin by set the example of a similar honest Locher, and into French by Bade; title-page—"The shyp of Folsys, and the English editor, a priest of St. Mary Ottery, Devonshire, simply translated . . . out of Latine, Frenche, and Doyche, into Englyshe told the truth, as did Coverdale. tonge." London, R. Pynson, 1509. ² There was besides the Biblia Sacra of Rudelius, with marginal renderings, Cologne, 1527; and also

As there never was a sincerer soul than Coverdale, never a man who so frankly speaks the truth even to his own disparagement, it is astonishing that in this instance he should not have been taken at his word, when he points out so distinctly the sources of his version. But some authors discredit him. It almost sets one's teeth on edge to find the handsome title-page, in black and red, in Bagster's "Second Modern Edition" of Coverdale's Bible, presenting these astounding words: The Holy Scriptures of the Old and Newe Testamente with the Apocripha faithfully translated from the Hebrew and Greke, by Miles Coverdale, sometime Lord Bishop of Exeter, MDXXXV. Coverdale never made such an assertion as is here ascribed to him, and it is found in no title-page issued by him, nay, in none of the five title-pages which have been preserved. He would not for worlds have uttered or countenanced such a falsehood, giving the lie not only to himself, and to his first title-page, but also to his repeated assertions in the Dedication and Prologue. Pearson, editor of "Coverdale's Remains," avers that "his version throughout bears marks of a close attention to the original";¹ but its own author did not describe it in such terms. Anderson declares, "of Coverdale's qualifications as a translator from the original, there can be little, or rather no question after what Whittaker has so ably written respecting his acquaintance with Hebrew."² Whittaker,³ whose remark on the title-page has been already quoted, did affirm that Coverdale translated from the Hebrew, and in proof he has adduced what he regards as four "crucial instances," in which the version differs from the Septuagint and the Vulgate, from Luther and Pagninus; and his inference is that in these cases it must be an immediate translation "from the Hebrew and from *nothing else*." His first adduced proof is Coverdale's rendering of Isaiah lvii, 5, it being "singly sufficient in deciding this

a Dutch and a German version. See Steigenberger's literarisch-kritische Abhandlung über die zwei alleralteste gedruckte Deutsche Bibeln, &c., München, 1787.

¹ Remains, p. xvii, Parker Society edition.

² Annals, vol. I, p. 564.

³ Historical and Critical Enquiry, p. 52, &c.

point." The verse reads in our version, "Enflaming yourselves with idols under every green tree," and Coverdale has, "Ye take your pleasure under the oaks and under all green trees." The Septuagint, Vulgate, Luther, and Pagninus mistook the meaning of the term properly rendered "oaks," and made it "gods" or "idols." The Zürich Bible has, Ir habend hitzen genommen under den Eychen, under allen grünen Baumen. In the first clause Coverdale feebly follows Luther's "in der Brunst," and the *incalescentes* of Pagninus, vailing somewhat the distinct allusion to the lustful heathen orgies; but the second clause is translated directly from Luther and the Zürich Bible. The Hebrew simply is "Enflamed by the oaks under every green tree," but to it, of course, Coverdale paid no attention. Whittaker's second instance is Numbers x, 31, "and thou shalt be our eye,"¹ but in rendering "oure eye," Coverdale follows the Zürich and Luther, the Hebrew being plural or rather dual, "eyes," as in Pagninus, and in the Authorized Version. In the third instance, Exodus xxxiv, 30, Coverdale varies from the Hebrew, and from Pagninus; but he follows the Zürich Bible and Luther, the Hebrew being literally, "And Aaron and all the children of Israel saw Moses, and beheld the skin of his face shine"; Coverdale having, "And when Aaron and all the children of Israel saw that the skynn of his face shyned," omitting the proper name.² Whittaker's last example is Daniel iii, 25, given from the Chaldee in our version, "the form of the fourth is like unto the Son of God"—the Vulgate being similar; but Coverdale renders "and the fourthe was like an angel to loke upon." Luther is literal, "a son of the gods"; but Coverdale follows the Zürich version.³ Whittaker's argument virtually amounts to this—that in those verses in which Coverdale forsook the Vulgate and the Septuagint, he must have clung to the Hebrew. But a brief collation might have dispelled the illusion. The editor of Bagster's "English Hexapla," aware that Coverdale did not

¹ Unser auge.

popular portraits of Moses with

² The Vulgate rendering of "cornutam faciem" gave rise to the

horns. Compare Hab. iii, 4.

³ Gleich wie ein Engel.

always follow Luther, calls his version "a faithful version of the original Scriptures," asserting that Whittaker has well defended the fame of Coverdale, but adding, "yet it must be confessed that his version is very often free, and there are some renderings so peculiar that one is at a loss to find the translator's authority, as for instance, Isaiah i, 8, "Syon is left alone like . . . a watchhouse in tyme of warre"; xvi, 1 (in modern spelling), "Then sent the lordes of the land a man of war from the rock." But the "authority" is very evident, for both versions are from the Zürich Bible, and the second is a very literal translation. Lewis, to show why Coverdale's is rightly called a "special translation"¹ gives as a sample Genesis xxix, 31, 32, setting side by side Tyndale's and Coverdale's versions. Now in these two verses Tyndale keeps by the Hebrew, omitting, however, the particle rendered "surely" and "now therefore" in our version; but Coverdale prints again an accurate translation from Luther and the Zürich Bible.

Dr. Ginsburg, in Appendix II to his Commentary on Ecclesiastes, has shown that Coverdale's version of that book rests entirely on the Zürich or Swiss-German Bible. He has made out the point beyond all dispute, though in one of his proofs he has fallen into a little blunder. In Ecclesiastes ii, 5, Coverdale has "trees of all manner fruites," representing the German,² and Dr. Ginsburg argues that he has even followed the Swiss construction, "at the expense of the English idiom, making manner into an adjective." But the remark is not correct, for Coverdale simply preserves an old English idiom of his own time. Thus we find "all manner herbs," Luke xi, 42, in Tyndale, Coverdale, the Great Bible, the Genevan, and the Bishops'; and the idiom still survives in the present editions of the Authorized Version, "all manner vessels of ivory," &c., Rev. xviii, 12. The same form also occurs in the Genevan and the Bishops' in 1 Peter ii, 13, "all manner ordinance." In the first issues of the Authorized Version it is met with repeatedly, Lev. vii, 23, "no manner fat," xiv, 54, "all

¹ History of Translation, p. 97, 2nd ed. ² Allerley fruchten.

manner plague," but "of" is inserted in Dr. Scrivener's Cambridge edition. The idiom occurs also in Sir Thomas More, "what manner folk they be," and in Tyndale's Pathway, "all manner vices," though in the previous paragraph he has "two manner of people"; and Chaucer, in the Clerk's Tale, has "a manner serjeant." Thus the proofs brought forward to show that Coverdale translated at once from the Hebrew, only show that his title-page was an honest and accurate avowal. In a word, his Old Testament is not taken at all from the original Hebrew, either professedly or in fact; but is only a secondary translation, based chiefly on the Swiss-German or Zürich Bible.¹ Similar remarks may be made about the Apocrypha, from which the prayer of Manasses is excluded, because the Zürich Bible had not admitted it. There is no proof that Coverdale made any use whatever of the Hebrew text, or even that he had any fair knowledge of the Hebrew language. The name Jehovah, indeed, stands in Hebrew characters at the apex of the title-page; and Hebrew letters mark in the margin the divisions of the alphabetic chapters in the Book of Lamentation, though not in the sections of the 119th Psalm, where, however, they are found in the edition of 1550.

¹ The Zürich Bible was to a great extent a revision of Luther's, so far as he had proceeded—that is, of the Pentateuch, Historical Books, and Hagiographa, with a new translation of the Prophets and Apocrypha, and an assimilation of his language to the Swiss-German dialect. It appeared at intervals, 1524-29, and was republished in 1530. The ministers of Zürich engaged in the work were Zuingli, Leo Judæ, Pellicanus, and others. Leo Judæ, who became minister of St. Peter's Church in 1522, was not a Jew, his father's name being John Jud; but many, from the form of his name, believed him to be of Hebrew descent, so that he sometimes called himself Leo Keller; in Zürich itself he was Meister Löw, representing Leo. Pellicanus, a voluminous author, was professor of Hebrew at Zürich, his native name being Kürschner (Skinner); died in 1556.

CHAPTER XIX.

LIGHT is also thrown upon Coverdale's method of procedure by the notes which are loosely scattered throughout his Bible. These notes, especially introduced by "Some reade," let us see incidentally what translations he was consulting, as the *débris* in front of the mine reveals the nature of the strata through which the miner has been piercing his way. There are only sixty-six notes in all—forty-seven in the Old Testament and nineteen in the New—and they are very capriciously distributed, there being fifteen in Genesis, and nineteen in Exodus, while there are none in Isaiah, and only two in the Minor Prophets. The distribution in the New Testament is similar, there being eight in Matthew, only two in Romans, one in Titus, and none in the subsequent books. If the original plan may be inferred from the number of notes in Genesis, then, for some reason or other, it was not carried out, and was finally dropped. There may have been some haste in the printing of the work, and the hope of a more convenient season, if a new edition should be contemplated. The majority of the notes are from the Zürich Bible, others are taken almost equally from Pagninus¹ and Luther, and not a few from the Vulgate. But this selection of notes from "Douche and Latyn," when

¹ Sanctes Pagninus, a Dominican monk, and pupil of Savonarola, first taught Oriental literature at Rome, under the patronage of Leo X, then removed to Avignon, and finally to Lyons. He published in small folio, at Lyons, in 1528, a new Latin trans-

lation of the Bible—a work done very carefully—the translation being very literal, and the verses being marked and numbered. The edition by Arias Montanus is an inter-linear gloss.

they are compared with the clauses in the text to which they are appended, verifies Coverdale's honest title-page, and shows the proportional influence of those versions on his own eclectic translation.

- Genesis ii, 12. Some call it "Schoham"—Zürich Bible; text, "onyxe"—Luther and the Vulgate.
18. Some reade, "To stonde next by him"—Zürich Bible; text, "to bear him company"—Tyndale.
- iii, 6. Some reade, "whyle it made wyse"—Luther; text, "a pleasant tree to make wise"—Tyndale.
16. Some read, "Thou shalt bowe downe thyselfe before thy husbände"—a paraphrase based upon Luther; text, "thy lust shall pertain unto thy husband"—Tyndale. See Münster's Note.
- iv, 7. Some reade, "let it be subdued unto thee and rule thou it"—Luther and virtually Tyndale; text, "shall he be subdued unto thee, and wilt thou rule him"—Zürich Bible.
- viii, 7. Some reade, "came not agayne"—Vulgate and Septuagint; text, "came again"—Zürich Bible and Tyndale who follows Luther. The Authorized Version fully represents the Hebrew.
- xi, 2. Some reade, "from the east"—Vulgate and Tyndale; text, "toward the east"—Luther and the Zürich Bible.
- xvii, 1. Some reade, "I am the God Schadai" (that is, plenteous in power, abundant, sufficient, and full of good)—a bracketed note in the Zürich Bible; text, "I am the Almighty God"—Vulgate and Luther.
- xviii, 10. Some reade, "as soone as the frute can lyve"—Tyndale; text, "about this time twelvemonth, if I live"—Zürich Bible.
- xxiii, 4. Some reade, "my corpse that lieth before me"—Luther; text, "my corpse by me"—Zürich Bible.
- xxiv, 31. Some reade, "thou beloved"—Zürich Bible; text, "thou blessed of the Lord"—after Luther and the Vulgate, more correctly resembling the Hebrew.

- Genesis xxvii, ²⁵26. "That my herte may wyssh thee good"—virtually from the Zürich Bible; text, "my soul may bless thee"—after the Vulgate and Luther.
- xxviii, 1. Some reade, "talked louingly with him"—Zürich Bible; text, "and blessed him"—Vulgate, Luther, and Tyndale.
- xxxiii, 19. Some reade, "an hundreth lambes"—Vulgate, Tyndale, and Pagninus, who has in his margin, "centum nummis"; text, "an hundred pence"—Luther and the Zürich Bible reading, however, "umb hundert groschen."
- xli, 45. "Zaphnath Paena, that is to saye, an expounder of secrete thinges, or a man to whom secrete thinges are opened"—the explanation being from Pagninus, with the clauses reversed, and the spelling of the Hebrew word being copied from the Zürich Bible and Tyndale. The adventurous note in our present Bibles, referring to the Coptic for explanation, is not in the first edition of 1611.
- Exodus ix, 16. Some reade, "I have holden thee up"—Zürich Bible; text, "have I stirred thee up"—Luther and Tyndale.
- xvi, 15. Some reade, "What is this"—Vulgate and Tyndale; text, "this is man"—Luther and Zürich Bible.
- xvii, 16. That is, "the Lorde is he that lifteth me vp"—virtually from Pagninus, "dominus elevatio mea," the marginal note being "vel signum meum"; text, "the Lord Nissi"—Luther and the Zürich Bible, Tyndale having "Jehovah Nissi," with the marginal note, "that is, the Lord is he that exalteth."
- xxix, 28. "Some call them peace-offerings"—Vulgate, Luther having "thank-offerings"; text "dead-offerings"—Zürich Bible.
- Num. xxxiii, 52. "Hill chapels, or altares builded vpon hilles"—the last clause being the translation of Tyndale; text, "destroy all their high places"—Vulgate and Luther.

- Joshua iii, 15. Some reade, "of the haruest"—virtually Vulgate and Luther; text, "it was full of all manner waters of the land"—Zürich Bible.
- Ruth iii, 3. Some reade, "Anoynte thee"—Pagninus, Luther, Vulgate, and Tyndale; text, "muffle thee"—Zürich Bible.
- 1 Sam. xxiii, 28. "Sela Mahelkoth, the rock of parting asunder"—Pagninus, the spelling of the Hebrew word after Luther, the explanation being a translation of his note, and of a bracketed clause in the Zürich Bible.
- 2 Sam. viii, 18. Some reade "rulers"—after the margin of Pagninus, Tyndale having "chief rulers"; text, "priests"—Luther and the Zürich Bible.
- xvi, 22. In reference to Absalom's incestuous intercourse with his father's harem on the roof of the palace, the note is, "the houses were flat in those partes at that tyme."
- 1 Kings ii, 17. That is, "He shall not denye the thy petition"—virtually from the Vulgate, Tyndale's rendering being preserved in the Authorized Version; text, "for he shall not shame thy face"—based on Luther.
- vii, 26. A Bat was a certayne measure of liquore—a note not unlike it being in Matthew's Bible.
- xvi, 7. "The prophet," explanatory of "this man" in the text; the Vulgate having "that is, John the son of Hanani," and there is an alternative, rendering in the Zürich Bible.
- 2 Kings vi, 25. A Cab is a certayne measure, a similar note being in Matthew's Bible.
- xv, 13. Some reade, "Vsia,"—Zürich Bible; text "Azarias"—Vulgate.
30. That is Asarias whom some call Vsia—a similar note in Matthew's Bible.
- xxiii, ³⁰31. "That is Jechonias."
- xxv, 6. Some reade, "And they talked with him of iudgment"—Zürich Bible and Pagninus; text, "And he gave judgment upon him"—Luther, the singular being also in the Vulgate.

- 2 Kings xxv, 23. "Otherwyse called Masphat," the Vulgate having Maspha; Matthew's Bible, Mazphag.
- 2 Chron. vii, 20. Some reade, "them"—Zürich and Pagninus; text, "you"—Vulgate.
- xxii, 6. "That is Ochosias, otherwyse called Ahasia," the first name being in the Vulgate, and the second in Luther; text, "Azarias"—Zürich Bible.
- Ezra iii, 7. Otherwyse called "Japho"—Zürich Bible; text, "Joppa," after Vulgate and Tyndale.
- Nehemiah ix, 10. Some reade, "them," the same note being repeated in Matthew's Bible after Zürich Bible; text, "madest thee a name"—Vulgate.
- Job iii, 3. "Simile Jere, xx"—a reference to the striking similitude of language.
- ix, 9. "Some call these seven starres the clock hen with hir chekens."
- Ps. xiv, 5, 6, 7. "These three verses are not in the Hebrue." They are found in the Vulgate and Septuagint, and are quoted in Romans iii, 11, &c.
- xxxvii, 21. Some reade thus, "the vngodly lendeth vpon vsury, and not for naught"—Zürich Bible, "auff wücher leycht der gottloss"; text, "the ungodly borroweth & payeth not again"—Vulgate, Luther, and Pagninus.
- xl, 6. Some reade thus, "but myne ears hast thou opened"—Luther and the Zürich Bible; text, "a body hast thou ordained me," which, however, is not in accordance with the Hebrew. Compare Hebrews x, 5.
- Jeremiah i, 18. "Or brass"—Vulgate; the text correctly, "a wall of steel."
- Amos vii, 7. "Some call it a lyne," after Pagninus, Luther having "plumb-line"; text, "a mason's trowell"—Zürich Bible, which has the alternative reading Richtschnür, technically meaning a level.
- Malachi ii, 15. "The one"—"This the interpreters reken to be spoken of Abraham," as in the note of Pagninus, "unus quidam Abraham"; text, "so did not the one"—Luther, but "excellent spirit" is from the same note of Pagninus.

The Zürich Bible adopts quite a different interpretation, "he has not only made the man (but the wife) also."

- Matthew i, 18. Some reade, "before they sat at home together"—Zürich Bible; text, "before they came together," after Erasmus.
- ii, 6. Some reade, "least"—Luther and the Zürich Bible, the more correct "less" of the text being from Tyndale's second edition.
- xvi, 13. Some reade, "that I the sonne of man am"—Tyndale's second edition; text, "that the son of man is"—Luther.
- xx, 25. Some reade, "the greatest deale with violence," after Luther; text, "exercise power"—Tyndale's second edition.
- xxiii, 5. "Philateries were writings wherein the commaundementes were wrytten."
15. "Proselyte, a nouyce or conuerte, turned from the beleue of the Heythen vnto the Jewes."
25. Some reade, "vncleannes"—Zürich Bible; text, "excess"—Tyndale's second edition.
- xxvi, 7. Some reade, "a glas with precious water"—Luther; text, "a box with precious ointment"—after Tyndale.
- Mark i, 11. Some reade, "in whom I am pacified"—Luther; text, "in whom I delight"—Tyndale.
- iii, 21. Some reade, "He wil go out of his witt," after Luther; text, "he taketh too much upon him," after the Zürich Bible.
- xiii, 9. Some reade, "councell-houses," after Luther; text, "councils"—Tyndale.
- Luke i, 39. "the city of Jewry," the note being "Jerusalem." Incorrect, however, for it was not the city of Judah referred to.
- Acts ix, 40. Some reade, "She sat up"—Tyndale's second edition; text, "she sat her down again"—Vulgate and Luther.
- xv, 3. Some reade, "conuersion"—Tyndale's second edition; text, "conversation"—Luther and Tyndale's first edition.

Acts xvii, 18. Some reade, "devyls"—Tyndale; text, "gods"—Luther.

xxvii, 17. "Syrtes are perloous places in the see."

Romans iii, 28. Some reade, "By faith onely"—Luther; text, "through faith"—Tyndale.

x, 17. Some reade, "By preachynge"—Luther; text, "by hearing"—Tyndale.

Titus. i, 12. "Epimenides," referred to as their awne prophet.

At the end of the Psalms, the Note on Sela bears, "In the Psalter, the word Sela commeth very oft, and (after the mynde of the interpreters) it is as much to say as allwaye, contynually, for ever, forsoyth, verily, a liftinge up of the voyce, or to make a pause & earnestly to consider & to ponder the sentence." But such terms as Maschil or Michtam, and the title Song of Degrees are omitted by him. Coverdale, leaning more to the Vulgate, neglected the shorter prefatory notes of Luther and the fuller ones of the Zürich Bible. To add some significance to proper names, he gives for Cush—Ethiopia, "the Morians"—Moors, after Luther and the Zürich Bible; Rabsaris, he makes chief chamberlain, and Rabshakeh chief butler, both after Luther and the Zürich Bible. He has the better translation in Gen. xlix, 6, "they houghed an ox"; after Tyndale and against the Vulgate, but virtually after his two German authorities.

A brief collation of a few verses of Genesis, as found in Tyndale (Matthew) and Coverdale, will bear out the previous statements as to the use made by Coverdale of the German versions.

	TYNDALE.	GENESIS XXII.	COVERDALE.
Verse			
1	After these dedes, God dyd proue Abraham, & sayde vnto hym; Abraham. And he answered, Here am I.	After these actes God tempted Abraham, & sayde vnto him, Abraham, And he answered, I am here.	
2	And he sayde: take thy onely sonne Isaac whom thou louest, and get the vnto the land Moria, & sacrifice hym there for a sacrifice vpon one of the moun-	And he sayde: Take thy sonne, this onely sonne of thine, even Isaac whom thou louest, and go thy waye in to the londe of Moria, & offre him there for a burnt-	

	TYNDALE.	GENESIS XXII.	COVERDALE.
Verse			
	taynes whiche I wylle shewe the.		offerynge vpon a mountayne that I shal shew the.
3	Than Abraham rose vp early in the morninge & saddled his asse, & toke two of his meyny with hym, & Isaac his sonne, & cloue wodd for the sacrifice, & rose vp & got him to the place which God had appoynted hym.		Then Abraham stode vp by tymes in the mornynge, & saddled his asse, & toke with him two yonge men, & his sonne Isaac, & clove wodd for the brentofferynge, gat him vp, & went on vnto the place wherof the Lorde had sayde vnto him.
4	The thirde daye Abraham lyfte vp his eyes, & sawe the place a farre of.		Vpon the thirde daye Abraham lift vp his eyes, & sawe the place a farre of.
5	And said vnto his yonge men: byde here with the asse, I & the lad wyl goo yonder & worshyp, & come agayne vnto you.		and sayde vnto his yonge men: Tary ye here with the Asse; as for me & the childe, we wyl go yonder: & when we haue worshipped, we wyl come to you againe.
6	And Abraham toke the wodd of the sacrifice, & layde it vpon Isaac hys sonne, & toke fyre in his hande, & a knyfe. And they wente bothe of them together.		And Abraham toke the wodd to the brentofferynge, & layed it vpon Isaac his sonne. As for himself, he toke the fyre and a knyfe in his hande, & wente on both together.
7	Than spake Isaac vnto Abraham his father & sayde: My father. And he answered, here am I my sonne. And he sayd: Se here is fyre & wodd but where is the shepe for sacrifice?		Then sayde Isaac vnto his father Abraham: My father. Abraham answered, here I am, my sonne. And he sayde, Lo, here is fyre & wodd, but where is the shepe for the brentofferynge?
8	And Abraham sayde: my sonne, God wyl provyde hym a shepe for sacrifice. So wente they bothe together.		Abraham answered: my sonne, God shall provyde him a shepe for the brentofferynge. And they wente both together.
9	And when they came vnto the place whiche God shewed him, Abraham made an aluter there, & dressed the wodd, & bownde Isaac his sonne, & layd him on the aluter aboue vpon the wodd.		And whan they came to the place which God shewed him, Abraham buylded there an altare, & layed the wodd vpon it, & bande his sonne Isaac, layed him on the altare, aboue vpon the wodd,

Verse	TYNDALE.	GENESIS XXII.	COVERDALE.
10	And Abraham stretched forth his hande & toke the knyfe, to haue kylled his sonne.	and stretched oute his hande, & toke the knyfe, to haue slayne his sonne.	
11	Than the angell of the Lorde called vnto him from heauen, sayinge: Abraham, Abraham. And he answered, here am I.	Then the angell of the Lorde called from heauen vnto him & sayde: Abraham, Abraham. He answered: here am I.	
12	And he sayde: laye not thy handes vpon the chylde, nether do anye thyng at all vnto him, for nowe I knowe that thou fearest God, in that thou haste not kepte thyne onely sonne from me.	He sayde: Laye not thy handes vpon the childe, & do nothinge vnto him: for now I knowe that thou fearest God, & hast not spared thine onely sonne for my sake.	
13	And Abraham lyfted vp his eyes and loked aboute, & beholde there was a ram caughte by the hornes in a thykette. And he went & toke the ram & offred him vp for a sacrifice in the steade of his sonne.	Then Abraham lift vp his eyes & sawe behynde him a ramme, holden fast by the hornes in the breres, & wente & toke the ramme, & offred him for a brent-sacrifice in steade of his sonne.	
14	And Abraham called the name of the place, the Lord wyll see: wherefore it is a comen saying this day: in the mounte wyll the Lorde be sene.	And Abraham called the place: The Lorde shall prouyde: Therefore it is a comon sayenge yet this daye, Vpon the mountayne shal the Lorde prouyde.	

In this paragraph Tyndale for the most part follows the Hebrew, and now and then agrees with the Vulgate; but Coverdale in every instance where he forsakes Tyndale is led by Luther and the Zürich Bible. Nay, he deserts both Luther and the Vulgate in not a few places in his Bible in order to follow the Swiss-German version. There is at the same time ample evidence that Coverdale consulted the portions of the Old Testament which Tyndale had published. Every page of his Pentateuch is flecked with clauses suggested by Tyndale's version, but he does not seem to have made any use of the "Epistles from the Old Testament," appended to the edition of 1534.

The New Testament of Coverdale is greatly superior to his

Old Testament. Its basis is Tyndale, with many variations, especially in the Epistles. Yet with all these variations, it rests so completely on Tyndale's New Testament, especially that of 1534, that it may be called a new edition of it—nay, it is in some books a mere reprint—the changes that do occur being due, as may be anticipated, to the Zürich version. Thus in the first section of John xv, 1, "a" for "the"; 2, "bringeth forth" for "beareth," "shall be cut off" for "he will take away," both in the Zürich Bible; 3, "because of" for "through" (thorow) "propter," Vulgate; 4, "like as" for "as"; "even so neither ye also" for "no more can ye"; 6, "branch" for "vine"; 7, "ye shall ask" for "ask." These changes are suggested by the Vulgate and the German versions. In the first chapter of Galatians there are over twenty clauses differing from Tyndale. Of these five are from Tyndale's second edition, the others from the Vulgate and the German translations. The first section of Galatians iii shows some revision. In verse 2 the "else" of Tyndale is omitted, and in 3 the participle is turned into a finite verb, "ye beganne"; the statement in 4 is made a question, "have ye suffered so much?" in 5, "which ministereth" becomes "he that giveth," and "miracles" is altered into "great actes"; in 6, "ascribed to" is changed into "counted to"; in 7, "this ye know" takes the place of "understand therefore"; in 8, "justify," the ethical present supersedes "would justify;" "and said" is a supplement from the Zürich Bible, and "heathen" is used for "nations"; in 10, "go about with" is suggested by the "umgehen" of the Zürich Bible; "to do them" is better than "to fulfil them." These variations, made some of them for the sake of clearness and rhythm, all rest on the Douche and Latyn versions which Coverdale so honestly professed to follow.

In the Epistles of St. John, Tyndale has also been revised, and some of the connecting particles changed; and similarly in St. Peter, some of the variations being found in the Authorized Version, as i, 3, "according to"; 4, "fadeth not." St. James is a mere reprint, and so is St. Jude—the chief, if not the only change, in the former Epistle being a conformity to Tyndale's first edition; the omission of the words "with sophistry" in

James i, 22. Rev. ii, 3, "for my name's sake hast laboured" is taken also from the first edition, the strange rendering of the edition of 1534, "and dydest wasshe thyself," the reading of Erasmus in 1516 and 1519.¹

Some of Coverdale's renderings in other parts of Galatians are retained in the Authorized Version, such as iii, 6, "counted"; 10, "under curse"; 15, "confirmed"; 24, "unto Christ"; 29, "according to promise," Tyndale having "ascribed"; "malediction," "allowed," "unto the time of Christ," "by promise." Many of his translations in other parts of the New Testament are also preserved in our present version, and these are better than Tyndale's of 1534. Matt. ii, 12, "In a dream"; iii, 14, "I have need to be"; vi, 10, "thy kingdom"; 12, "debts"; vii, 21, "the will of my Father"; x, 41, "a righteous man's reward"; xiii, 30, "till the harvest"; xvi, 3, "it will be foul weather to-day"; xvii, 6, "overshadowed"; xxi, 28, "but what think ye?" xxiii, 9, "One is your Father"; xxiv, 28, "there will the eagles be gathered together"; xxv, 21, "enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." Canon Westcott refers to two other renderings in 1 John ii, 16, "the pride of life," and 17, "the world passeth away." The fact is that, in the Authorized Version, Tyndale's renderings are adopted about three times oftener than those of Coverdale, though in many cases both are refused, even when they agree together. Other clauses not preserved in the current translation are also very good. Galatians iv, 5, "that we might receive the childship," is preferable to Tyndale's circuitous phrase, "that we through election might receive the inheritance which belongeth unto the natural sons"; vi, 1, "overtaken of a fault"; Tyndale, "fallen by chance into a fault"; 2 Thessalonians i, 7, "with the angels of his power," Tyndale having "with his mighty angels." Like Tyndale, he has the terms to which Sir Thomas More so vehemently objected, "love" and "congregation" which "charity" and "church" afterwards superseded. He has also, as Tyndale had, "knowledge" for "confess," and both use "similitude" for "parable"; but for Tyndale's

¹ Referring in his Annotations to two editions, Erasmus brands it this reading, though he kept it in thus—*sed mendax ni fallor*.

"repent" in Matt. iii, 1, he has "amend your selves." "Centurion" in Tyndale is "captain" in Coverdale; "unleavened bread" is "sweet bread," in both an imitation of Luther's süßesbrod, the contrast being suggested by sauerteig (leaven). After him they both have "Easter," and occasionally "Easter lamb." But with all the excellencies of his version no one who has looked into the question can accept the statement of Geddes, that the Authorized Version is "of less merit, and is less in accordance with the original, than that of Coverdale."

CHAPTER XX.

TH**ERE** are, as might be anticipated from the man and the time, many quaint and antique renderings in Coverdale.

Gen. viii, 11, and she bare it (an olive leaf) in her nebb—the last term being still in familiar use among Scottish boys.

Joshua ii, 11, our hert hath failed us, neither is there a good stomacke in eny man.

Judges vi, 19, layed the flesh in a maunde and put the broth in a pot; ⁴ 53, cast a pece of a mylstone upon Abimelech's heade and brake his brain panne; xi, 39, she had never been in daunger of eny man (Romans, iii, 19, and that all the world may be endangered to God);¹ xv, 19, then God opened a gome tooth in the cheke bone, so the water went out; xvii, 5, the man Micah had a god's house, and made an overbody cote (ephod) and idols; xx, 32, let us flye, that we may provoke them out of the city into the bye stretes.

Ruth ii, 1, Boaz, which was an honest man.

1 Sam. iv, 17, then answered the tydinge bringer and sayde; x, 1, then toke Samuel a glasse of oyle and poured it upon his head; xx, 30, thou wicked and unthryfte, I know that thou hast chosen the son of Isai to the shame of thyselff and of thy shameful mother; xxi, 13, and stackered towarde the dores of the gate, and his slaveringes ranne downe his beerde; xxv, 18, five sheep ready dighted, and five measures of frimentye.

2 Sam. xiii, 6, make me a syppyng or two; xiv, 14, and God will not take away the lyfe, but unbethynketh himself that even the very outlaw be not clean thrust out from him; xxii,

¹ Bishop's Bible.

11, He sat upon cherub and dyd flye, and appeared upon the fethers of the wynde.

1 Kings xii, 11, I will nourture you with scorpions; xvii, 12, a curtesy oyle in a cruse; xxii, 34, and shott the king of Israel between the mawe and the lunges.

2 Chron, xxv, 12, and cast them downe headlinges from the toppe of the mount, so that they all to burst in sunder.

Job iii, 5, let it be lapped in with sorowe; v, 7, it is man that is borne vnto misery, lyke as the byrde for to fle; vi, 16, they that feare the horefroste, the snow shal fal vpon them; xiii, 4, As for you, ye are workmasters of lyes; xiv, 21, Whether his children come to worship or no, he can not tell; xvii, 1, My breth fayleth, my dayes are shortened, I am hard at deathes dore; xix, 17, Myne owne wyfe may not abyde my breth: I am fayne to speake fayre vnto the children of mine owne body; 18, Yee the very deserte fooles despyse me; xxxix, 25, He feareth not the noyse of the trompettes; but as soon as he heareth the shawmes blowe, tush (sayeth he), for he smelleth the batell afarre of.

Psalme xiv, 1, The foolish bodyes saye in their hertes, Tush, there is no God; lxviii, 11, the Lorde shal geve the worde with greate hoostes of evangelistes; lxxiv, 5, men maye se the axes glister aboue, like as those that hewe in the wod. They cutt downe all the sylinge worke of ye sanctuary with bylles and axes. xci, 5, thou shalt not nede to be afrayde of eny bugges by night; cxix, 70, their herte is as fat as brawn.¹

Prov. xvi, 18, after a proude stomacke there followeth a fall 28, he that is a blabbe of his tonge maketh devysion; xvii, 14, he that soweth discorde and strife is like on that dyggeth up a water broke; xxiii, 2, measure their appetite.

Isaiah ii, 4, So that they shal breake their swerdes and speares, to make sythes, sycles, and sawes thereof; 6, or in calkers of mens byrthes; v, 9, the Lord of hoostes rowneth me thus; 22, Wo vnto them that are connyng men to suppe

¹ Luther, dick wie Schmeer; Vulders. Chaucer has "full big he was gate, sicut lac. Brawns occurs in of braun." Grease of our version Wycliffe, Job xxii, 9; the second came from the Genevan, and it is version having "schuldris"—shoulder nearer in sense to the Hebrew term.

out wyne; 27, no one faynte nor feble amonge them, no not a slogish or nor sleperry parson; vi, 2, From aboue flakred the seraphins; 4, the geastes and dore chekes moued at their crienge; x, 15, or doth the sawe make eny krakinge against him that ruleth it; xxiv, 20, The erth shal geue a greate crack, it shal haue a sore ruyne, and take an horrible fall; xliv, 6, and do wherthorow he maye be lickened vnto me; lvi, 3, neither shal the gelded man saye, I am a drie tre.

Jer. viii, 2, there is no triacle in Galaad. xvii, 1, graven vpon the edge of your aulters with a pen of iron and with an adamant clawe.

Dan. ix, 26, after the lxvii weekes shall Christ be slain, and they shall haue no pleasure in him.

Hosea xi, 3, I learned Ephraim to go.

Matt. ii, 2, the newe borne kynge.

Mark iii, 21, he taketh to moch vpon him; vi, 2, marueled at his lernynge; viii, 16, their myndes wauered here and there; xv, 29, Fye vpon the, how goodly breakest thou downe the temple.

Luke x, 40, Martha made her self moch to do; xi, 8, because of his vnshamefast begginge.

John i, 38, Where art thou at lodginge? xviii, 39, that I should give one vnto you lowse at easter.

Acts v, 14, slayd them vpon beddes and barowes; vi, 1, because their wyddowes were not loked vpon in the daylie hand-reachinge; xvii, 11, they were the Eldest amonge them at Thessalonica.

1 Cor. ii, 1, I came not with hye words.

2 Cor. i, 18, O faitfull God, that oure worde vnto you hath not bene yee and naye.

Eph. iv, 16, one member hangeth by another thorowout all the iontes.

Philip. i, 10, that maybe pure and soch as hurte no man's conscience. ¹⁸

Colos. ii, 10, Let no man make you shéte at a wronge mark, which after his owne chosynge walketh in humbleness, and spirituallite of angels, thinges which he neuer sawe.

1 Tim. vi, 4, but waysteth his brayne aboute questions and stryuynges of wordes.

Obsolete terms sometimes occur, as "to clyp"—to shear sheep; a "maund," a large basket; "body," the foolish bodyes saye in their hertes; "symnel," a cake; "lever," rather; "to spar," that is, to close the door—spar meaning bar. Still several of his phrases have also descended to us—Judges v, "a lordly dish;" "garments of needlework;" Tyndale (Matthew) having a different rendering; and we have still many verses with almost no change. Many such passages occur in the Psalter, as Psalms li, 11; lxiii, 2; cii, 25; cxliii, 2.

Though Coverdale may not be everywhere correct, he is always musical. A few examples may suffice in proof:—

Psalms xc, 10, The dayes of oure age are thre score yeaeres and ten; xcix, 1, The Lord is kynge, be the people never so impacient: he sytteth vpon the cherubins, be the earth never so vnquiete.

Isaiah xlviii, 16-19, Wherefore the Lorde God with his sprete hath sent me. And thus saith the Lord, thine avenger, the holyone of Israel: I am the Lorde thy God, which teach the profitable thinges, and lede ye the waye, that thou shuldest go. Yf thou wilt now regarde my commaundement, thy welthynes shalbe as the water streame, and thy rightousnes as the waues flowinge in the see: Thy sede shalbe like as the sonde in the see, and the frute of thy body like the grauel stones therof; thy name shal not be roted out, nor destroyed before me.

Though Coverdale's version was only secondary, yet it possessed merits of its own. The gentle flow of its English is idiomatic and fresh, though many words and phrases are now antiquated, and it may still be read with pleasure in the Psalms of the English Book of Common Prayer, of which it is the basis. His own "Ghostly Psalms" are sometimes a little rugged; but his prose translation is beautiful in its rhythm. The simple grandeur of many portions of Isaiah and the prophets was initiated by him. He often omits, like Tyndale, connecting particles, and smoothness is now and then secured by a paraphrase at the expense of terseness and brevity. Changes of order, variations of renderings, tuneful turns of phrase, resolution of participles and relative pronouns, and

numerous literary dexterities are used to secure the same result, a result that still gives tone and cadence to the Authorized Version. No little of that indefinable quality that gives popular charm to our English Bible, and has endeared it to so many generations, is owing to Coverdale. The semitones in the music of the style are his gift.¹ What we mean will be apparent to any one who compares the Authorized Version, especially in the Old Testament, with the exacter translations of many of the books which have been made by scholars and critics. Tyndale gave us the first great outline distinctly and wonderfully etched, but Coverdale added those minuter touches which soften and harmonize it. The characteristic features are Tyndale's in all their boldness of form and expression, the more delicate lines and shadings are the contribution of his successor, both in his own version and in the Great Bible revised and edited by him.

The first edition of Coverdale's Bible was soon exhausted, and the thirst for possessing a copy was even growing. But though the Dedication to the king secured no royal license or patronage, the work was not forbidden or suppressed. When, in June, 1536, Convocation prayed the king "that he would indulge unto his subjects of the laity, the reading of the Bible in the English tongue, and that a new translation of it might be made for that end and purpose," the resolution amounted to a virtual condemnation of Coverdale's version.

In 1537 two editions—one in quarto, the other in folio—"overseen and corrected," were printed in London by James Nycolson, St. Thomas, Southwark; and at the foot of the title-page are the wondrous words, "Set forth with the Kynge's most gracious license"; the name of Queen Jane being substituted for that of Queen Anne in the dedication. Was Tyndale's dying prayer now answered, "Lord, open the King of England's eyes"?

Coverdale was always anxious that his countrymen should have free access to the Word of God in their own language, and that all the current prejudices against a native version should

¹ Even the rough and rugged Bale smooth, and flowing gently along." describes his style "as sweet and

be disarmed. To show them that a vernacular New Testament did not of necessity misrepresent the Latin one with which they were so familiar in the church service, he rendered it into the mother tongue, and printed it in both languages—the Vulgate and an English translation in parallel columns. Three editions of this Diglott Testament were published in 1538, the first by James Nycolson, with a dedication to the king and a preface to the reader. In the dedication Coverdale explains his purpose and method of procedure. The enemies of an English Bible are thus described: "Because it grieveth them that your subjects be grown so far in knowledge of their duty to God, to your grace, and to their neighbours, their inward malice doth break out into blasphemous and uncomely words; insomuch that they call your loving and faithful people heretics, new-fangled fellows, English biblers, cobblers of divinity, fellows of the new faith, &c., with such other ungodly sayings. It is to be feared that forwardness and malice is mixed with their ignorance. For, inasmuch as in our other translations we do not follow this old Latin text, word for word, they cry out upon us as though all were not as nigh the truth to translate the Scripture out of other languages as to turn it out of the Latin, or as though the Holy Ghost were not the author of His Scripture as well in the Hebrew, Greek, French, Dutch, and in English, as in Latin. The Scripture and Word of God is truly to every Christian man of like worthiness and authority, in what language soever the Holy Ghost speaketh it." Another motive alleged by him in printing the Latin and English text in parallel columns so as specially to induce and instruct "such as can but English, and are not learned in the Latin, that in comparing these two texts together they may the better understand the one by the other. And I doubt not but such ignorant bodies as, having cure and charge of souls, are very unlearned in the Latin tongue, shall through this small labour be occasioned to attain unto more knowledge, and at the least be constrained to say well of the thing which heretofore they have blasphemed."

The version is his own, carefully and minutely adapted to the Vulgate, "inasmuch as the New Testament which I had set

forth in English before doth so agree with the Latin, I was heartily well content that the Latin and it should be set together." Thus in Mark i, and suggested by the Latin:—

ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT.	DIGLOTT AFTER THE VULGATE. ¹
1 in the prophet.	in Esaye the prophet.
my messenger.	mine angel.
4 baptized and preached.	baptizing and preaching.
amendment.	penance.
5 and they of Jerusalem.	all they of Jerusalem.
in Jordan.	in the river of Jordan.
knowledging their sins.	confessing.
8 I baptized.	I have baptized.
9 at the same time.	in those days.
10 he was come out of.	coming up out of.
as a dove comynge downe.	descending and abiding.
11 in whom I delyt.	in thee am I pleased.
13 with the wylde beestes.	with beastes.

The first edition was "negligently corrected" during Coverdale's absence in Paris—was in fact so badly executed that he was forced to disown it, for it was in many places "base, insensible, and clean contrary, not only to the phrase of our language, but from the understanding." "Weeding out the faults," he superintended a new edition in Paris, printed by Francis Regnault and published by Grafton & Whitechurch, with a dedication to "Crumwell, Lord Privy Seal and Vicegerent to the King's Highness."² In spite of his remonstrance and

¹ In Isaia propheta, angelum meum; 4, baptizans et predicans, penitentiae; 5, Hierosolymitae universi, in Jordanis flumine, confidentes; 8, baptizavi; 9, in diebus istis; 10, ascendens, descendentem et manentem; 11, in te complacui; 13, cum bestiis. The Wycliffite versions taken from the Latin text are quite different, having for "prepare," in 3, "make redy"; in 5, the first version has "flood," and the second "flom," and both have the Saxon "knowledged"; in 6, the first version has "honey of the woods," and in 7 it gives "thong." The translations, 9, "it was done," and 11, "a voice was made," are in accordance with the constant literalism of these older versions.

² "The New Testament, both in Latin & English, after the vulgare texte, which is red in the church. Translated & corrected by Myles Coverdale, and prynted in Paris by Fraunces Regnault, mccccxxxviii,

of an apology put forward for him by Grafton, Nycolson printed another edition, affixing to it the name of John Hollybushe as translator; but with this volume Coverdale had no concern—it was, in fact, a revision of his own version. It was this Hollybushe's New Testament, an avowed translation from the Vulgate, that led Macknight so far astray in his opinion of Tyndale.

Coverdale's Bible, printed at Zürich by Froschover, with the strange misprint of "By Mayst. Thomas Mathewe" on the title-page, was published in London (Andrew Hester) in 1550, and there was also another issue of it in 1553, with a new title and kalendar (R. Jugge). Coverdale's subsequent Biblical labours in connection with the Great Bible will be immediately noticed.

in Novembre. Prynted for Richard citizens of London. Cum gratia et Grafton & Edward Whitechurch, privilegio Regis."

THOMAS MATTHEW'S BIBLE.

"THEN, amidst the hymns and halleluiahs of saints, some one may perhaps be heard offering at high strains in new and lofty measures, to sing and celebrate Thy divine mercies and marvellous judgments in this land, throughout all ages, whereby this great and warlike nation, instructed and inured to the fervent and continual practice of truth and righteousness, and casting far from her the rags of her old vices, may press on hard to that high and happy emulation to be found the soberest, wisest, and most Christian at that day, when Thou, the eternal and shortly expected King, shalt open the clouds to judge the several kingdoms of the world, and distributing national honours and rewards to religious and just commonwealths, shalt put an end to all earthly tyrannies, proclaiming thy universal and mild monarchy through heaven and earth, when they, undoubtedly, that, by their labours, counsels, and prayers, have been earnest for the common good of religion and their country shall receive, above the inferior orders of the blessed, the regal addition of principalities, legions, and thrones, into their glorious titles, and, in supereminence of beatific vision, progressing the dateless and irrevoluble circle of eternity, shall clasp inseparable hands with joy and bliss in over-measure for ever."

MILTON.

CHAPTER XXI.

TOWARD the conclusion of his Prologue to the reader, Coverdale, with characteristic candour and self-oblivion, had said of his Bible: "And though it be not worthily ministered unto thee in this translation, by reason of my rudeness: yet, if thou be fervent in thy prayer, God shall not only send it thee in a better shape by the ministration of other that began it afore,¹ but shall also move the hearts of them which as yet meddled not withal to take it in hand, and to bestow the gift of their understanding thereon, as well in our language as other interpreters do in other languages." The first part of the anticipation was not realized, as a few months after the words were written Tyndale was put to death. But the second part was fulfilled, though not exactly in the way which the prediction indicated, for a short time after the publication of Coverdale's version, another volume of Scripture made its appearance, and in peculiar circumstances. Though it was really a compilation and not a new version, and though it was published under another name than that of its compiler, it was destined to produce lasting results. This Bible was a folio, with the following title: "The Bible, which is all the Holy Scriptures, in which are containyd the Olde and Newe Testaments, truely and purely translated into Englysh, by Thomas Matthew. Esaye I, Hearcken to, ye heavens, and thou earth, geave eare: for the Lorde speaketh. MDXXXVII." The handsome title is printed in the centre of a large engraving which fills the page, and has at the bottom, in large red characters, "Set forth with the kinges most gracyous lycence."

¹ The reference being to Tyndale.

At the end of the exhortation to the study of the Holy Scriptures, which occupies one page, are printed, in large flourished capitals, I. R., John Rogers. The volume, in larger folio than Coverdale's Bible, consists of 1,110 pages, with sixty lines in a full page. The printing is in black letter, foreign in appearance, and there are nearly eighty woodcuts, two of them at the beginning of Psalms and Proverbs, filling the whole breadth of the page. On the reverse of the title itself, which is in black and red, is a short table of contents; then follow, covering four pages, a kalendar, and almanac for eighteen years, beginning with 1538; and it ends by telling "the yere has fifty-two weekes and six houres." The dedication to the king, Henry VIII, succeeds, and embraces three pages, with large flourished capitals at the commencement and conclusion. The next twenty-six pages are taken up with "a table of the pryncypall matters conteyned in the Byble," headed with a short address to the Chrysten readers. The succeeding page bears upon it "The names of all the Bokes of the Byble . . . and a Brief Rehersall of the yeares passed since the begynnynge of the worlde unto this yere of oure Lord MDXXXVII;" there being on the reverse a large engraving of Adam and Eve in paradise. The title-page of the New Testament, in black and red, which has the same ornamental engravings as that of the Old Testament, is, "The Newe Testament of our Saviour Jesu Christ, newly and dylygently translated into Englyshe, with annotations in the margent to helpe the reader to the understandynge of the texte. Prynted in the yere of our Lorde God, M.D.XXXVII." Five pages at the end of the New Testament are taken up with tables of the Epistles and Gospels, after Salisbury use, &c. On the last leaf is "The end of the Newe Testament, and of the whole Byble. To the honoure and prayse of God was this Byble prynted and fynessed in the yere of oure Lorde God, a M.D.XXXVII." The disputed text about the "three witnesses," in 1 John v, 7, is in smaller type. The following errata occur—in John xx, 25, the clause "put my finger into the holes of the nails" is omitted; so is the clause in 1 Cor. xi, 25, "This cup is the new testament in my blood"; and Rev. iii, 17, is printed "because thou art rich,"

the words "sayest thou" being left out. In Hebrews vi, 1, we find "Therefore let us love the doctrine," for "let us *leave*." The initials I. R. point out the editor of the volume as John Rogers, the first of the Marian martyrs, Thomas Matthew being merely assumed; or, if the name belonged to an actual person, no one has been at all able to identify him.

John Rogers was born about 1500, probably in a hamlet called Deritend, now swallowed up by the city of Birmingham. He was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, taking his degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1525. Foxe simply says of his academic life, "he profitably travailed in good learning."¹ According to one authority, he was chosen the same year a junior canon in Cardinal College, Oxford, and entered into holy orders.² He next became rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity,³ or Trinity the Less, in London, on the 26th of December, 1532, having been presented to the living by the prior and convent of St. Mary Overy in Southwark. This position he voluntarily resigned before the end of 1534, for his successor was admitted on 24th October of that year. It is probable that some change of religious opinion induced him to quit England for Antwerp, where he officiated for a time as chaplain to the Merchant Adventurers.⁴ At this epoch he had not formally left the popish communion, but did his priestly duties "according to the use and custom of the worshippers of idols." His views ripened "by little and little," and "day by

¹ Foxe, vol. VI, p. 591.

² Lewis, *History of Translations of the Bible*, p. 223, London, 1818.

³ This old church, "which stood on the south side of Knight Riders Street, in the eastern part thereof," was burned down in the great fire of 1666, and the parish was united to that of St. Michaels, Queenhithe. *Newcourt Repert.*, vol. I, p. 556, &c., *Life of John Rogers*, by Joseph Lemuel Chester, London, 1861.

⁴ Lambert the martyr, converted by Bilney to reformed opinions, was

also chaplain afterwards "for the space of a year and more." A description of the locality, and present appearance of the Merchants' House, may be found in Demaus, *Life of Tyndale*, p. 413, &c. The Merchant Adventurers were an old guild or corporation, and were originally called "Merchants of St. Thomas à Becket." They had a special charter, and many privileges, and in this way rose superior to an older body still—the "Merchants of the Staple."

day," till at length he embraced evangelical truth in its fulness—this complete change being fostered and perfected by his intimacy with William Tyndale and, Foxe adds, with Myles Coverdale. This friendship could not have lasted more than a few months, for Tyndale was martyred on the 6th October, 1536. As the result and token of final separation from the Church of Rome, Rogers followed the example of Luther, and, probably in 1537, married Adriana Pratt or de Weyden,¹ "more richly endowed with virtue and soberness of life, than with worldly treasures." When he came back with his wife to England, in the early part of the reign of Edward the Sixth, they brought with them eight children; and in his appeal to the Lord Chancellor, on 29th January, 1555, that Mrs. Rogers might be allowed to visit him in prison, he stated that he had been married eighteen years. After his marriage, which may have brought him into peril, he went to Wittenberg, and having now thoroughly mastered German, he was inducted into the pastoral charge of a congregation, to which he ministered for several years. Rogers had come to Antwerp a few months after the execution of Fryth; and since he had been with Tyndale, as Tyndale had been with Luther, Melanchthon, and their great associates—the peerage of the Reformation, it was natural that he should interest himself in the work of translating Scripture—a work which he saw in busy process every day of Tyndale's life, prior to his arrest and imprisonment. Familiarity led, no doubt, to admiration, and admiration at length enlisted co-operation and assistance.

A mystery hangs over the employment of the name Matthew in connection with this work of Rogers. Foxe says simply, and without any definite proof or illustration, "It seemed good to them which had the doing thereof to change the name of William Tyndale, because that name was odious, and to father it by a strange name of Thomas Matthew."² That ground is quite intelligible only so far as Tyndale is concerned. But a large portion of the Old Testament, and the entire Apocrypha, are certainly the work of Coverdale. Strype merely states the meagre fact, that Rogers "dedicated the whole

¹ Both names mean *meadow*.

² Vol. V, p. 412.

book to King Henry, under the name of Thomas Matthew, minding to conceal his own name."¹ But the reason so alleged is not strictly true, for the name of John Rogers was not really concealed, and his initials, I. R., stand at the end of the "Exhortation to the study of the Holy Scriptures." It has also been surmised that Thomas Matthew may have furnished money for the outlay, or may have had some other close connection with the volume. Indeed, the question presents a peculiar dilemma. The name is known only in its connection with this Bible; if Matthew was only a myth, or a man without a shadow, why are he and Rogers both indicated by distinct and separate names or initials in the volume, as if they were different individuals? and if he were an actual coadjutor in flesh and blood, how happened it that he fell so soon into oblivion, that his name came to be looked on by shrewd lawyers as a mere fiction, the transparent disguise of an alias? For there is no doubt that Rogers was officially identified with Matthew, and this within twenty years of the publication of the Bible. In the sentence which doomed him to the stake, he is four times called "Johannes Rogers² *alias* Matthew"; in Foxe's translation, "John Rogers otherwise called Matthew"; and in the Council Register of Queen Mary, "John Rogers *alias* Matthew is ordered to keep his house at Paul's." During the trial there was indeed no charge based on the Bible, for he was not the translator. Besides, his volume in its first form had been published with the king's license, and on being revised it had already passed into the Great Bible, published also under royal sanction. But Bishop Gardiner, presiding as chancellor, makes plain allusion to the dedication of the Bible, and twitted him as having acknowledged King Henry VIII to be supreme head of the Church, the dedication being to the "most noble and gracious prince, King Henry VIII, king of England, . . . defender of the faith, and, under God, the chief and supreme head of the Church of England." In 1542 a list of books forbidden

¹ Memorials of Cranmer, vol. I, p. 185, Oxford, 1848. *Johannem Rogers alias Matthew, presbyterum secularem.*

² The sentence runs—*contra te*,

specifies the notes of the Bible as "of Thomas Matthew's doing." In the reprint of this Bible, in 1551, the initial capital A is not only ornamented, but often there are engraved in its lower and wider part the letters I. R., and sometimes I is found on the one side of the apex and R on the other. So deeply indeed had the identity of Thomas Matthew and John Rogers sunk into the popular mind, that the lines of another martyr, Robert Smith, burned at Uxbridge, 8th August, 1555, were ascribed to him, and were published, not only as "Maister Rogers' Ryme to his Children," but also as "the Exhortation of Matthew Rogers."¹ It is thus plain that nobody at the time seems to have suspected that Matthew was other than John Rogers; but why that name should have been selected cannot now be ascertained.²

The origination of the volume is also hidden from us. What suggested the preparation of it is nowhere stated. Only it may be surmised that Rogers wished the English people to be put in possession of a complete English Bible, embodying all that the martyred Tyndale had already rendered; for he had rendered from the original texts, whereas Coverdale's was only a secondary version professedly taken, not from Hebrew and Greek, but from Douche and Latyn. Where the work was put to press is not known, whether at Hamburg, as Foxe, Strype, and Johnson conjecture; or at Paris, as Wanley thought; or at Antwerp, or Lubec, or at Marburg according to Lewis. Antwerp, as the residence of Rogers, is the most likely place—at least, there is no necessity for any other supposition. The printing of English by foreign compositors must have required constant watchfulness from some "corrector" on the spot,³ and the press must have been worked in speed and secrecy. According to Cotton, some of the engravings were taken from blocks, which had been already used in a Dutch Bible,

¹ These Rhymes were long a popular primer in New England.

² It is extraordinary that Hallam should make Matthew the printer. *Literature of Europe*, vol. I, p. 379, London, 1854.

³ Thus in Tischendorf's *English New Testament*, published by Tauchnitz at Leipzig, the misprints are evidently the errors of foreign compositors and readers.

issued at Lubec, in 1533.¹ But these blocks could easily be transferred to Antwerp. The first expense of printing was probably borne by some of the merchants, who had been so generous to Tyndale; but Richard Grafton and Edward Whitechurch, two citizens of London, suddenly interposed, and took the burden on themselves. Grafton, the printer, writing at this time about the order that no book should be printed without at least the license of one bishop, suggests that "certain be appointed thereto that they may be as ready to read them as other good men to put them forth. For it is now seven years since the bishops promised to translate and set forth the Bible, and as yet they have had no leisure." We are utterly ignorant as well of the process by which they learned that such a volume was contemplated, as of the motives which induced them to undertake the work. Men in those days of jeopardy did good by stealth, for if their well-doing rose into fame it might kindle for them a pyre at Smithfield. But it would appear that the printing had gone on as far as the beginning of Isaiah, when they stepped in to assist, probably purchasing what sheets had been already struck off, and making arrangements for the completion of the work. Certainly there is a blank page, and a new numbering commences at Isaiah with the title, "The Prophetes in Englishe," and on the opposite side of the page, and at its four corners, are the large initials, R. G., and E. W., Richard Grafton, Edward Whitechurch. Grafton, though he was a cautious man, seems to have embarked his whole fortune in the enterprise, and he is the principal correspondent with Cranmer in the business.

The statements often made about this Bible of 1537 are but inaccurate hypotheses; the connection of Tyndale and Coverdale with it has been misunderstood, and the proportions and character of their respective contributions to it have been very erroneously estimated.

1. Grafton, the printer of it, comes far short of the truth, when he ascribes to Tyndale only the translation of the New Testament, for the Pentateuch had been printed some years

¹ Editions of the Bible, &c., p. 12, second edition, Oxford, 1852.

before.¹ Baker, in his Chronicle, under 1535, says more definitely, and more correctly, that "Tindale was murdered at Villefort, in Flanders, for translating the New Testament and divers parts of the Old."²

2. Foxe³ speaks of Tyndale as "the greatest doer" in this translation, and, with the help of Miles Coverdale, "translating all the books, except only the Apocrypha—John Rogers at the same time being corrector of the print, who had then translated the residue of the Apocrypha." But the Apocrypha is beyond question Coverdale's version, as may be seen by looking into his Bible, and Rogers translated no portion of it. Foxe, in his first edition, had made the mistaken announcement that Coverdale's Bible was published in 1532, a date which the book itself visibly contradicts, as its title-page bears MDXXXV. Several writers, relying on the truth of the statement, seemed to infer that his Bible of a subsequent date was a prepared re-issue of this earlier volume, and the next and easy step was to imagine a confederacy of Tyndale, Coverdale, and Rogers, in the further revision of it.

3. Ofor, in the face of all evidence, thinks that perhaps Tyndale may have completed the entire Old Testament. But surely the incorporation of Coverdale's version, from the end of 2 Chronicles to the end of Malachi, disproves the conjecture. If Rogers could have employed Tyndale's version, he would not have preferred Coverdale's, and his insertion of Coverdale's Jonah only proves that Tyndale's was not accessible, for so scarce did it become that some have denied its very existence.⁴ Or another reason may be found in the fact that Coverdale's Jonah is but a revision of Tyndale's, as may be seen on a brief comparison.⁵ Thus, in the first chapter of the prophecy, Tyndale is far more in accordance with the Hebrew than Coverdale. The connecting particle "and" is usually preserved by Tyndale, while Coverdale omits it five times, and changes it into "so" three times, into "where" twice, and into "then" once, these changes being usually after the Zürich Bible.

¹ Chronicle, fol. 132, London, 1563.

² See pp. 205, 206.

³ P. 283, London, 1670.

⁴ Both versions have been printed in fac-simile by Mr. Fry. London, 1863.

⁵ Acts, &c., vol. V, p. 412.

Coverdale gives not a few of Tyndale's simpler clauses, word for word, and has also some of his most characteristic phrases such as, "gat him down," "wente aborde," "paid his fare," "the lorde hurled a great winde into the see," "gat him under the hatches, and layed him down and slombered," "the see wrought and was troublous," and not a few clauses are preserved word for word.

4. Bale asserts, and he is followed by Fuller, that Rogers translated the Bible from Genesis to the end of Revelation,¹ adding prefaces and notes from Luther, and making use of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, and English copies, the last explained by Strype as meaning Tyndale's translation. This statement gives Rogers credit for work which he did not do, and did not need to do, as the comparison of the various parts of the edition so clearly and strikingly testifies.²

5. Strype, in one place, describes the book as "Matthew's Bible, of Tyndale and Rogers' translation,"³ thus ignoring Coverdale, to whom undoubtedly is to be ascribed one-third of the volume—or all the Old Testament from 2 Chronicles with the Apocrypha—as any reader may determine at once for himself.

6. Anthony Johnson vaguely speaks of the "feigned name" of Thomas Matthews, and connects the Bible with Tyndale and Rogers—"Rogers having translated the Apocrypha, Tyndale having gone no farther than Nehemiah";⁴ while Newcome,⁵ more strangely still, tells us that Cranmer employed Rogers to superintend it, and Bishop Gray,⁶ without any inquiry, copies the inaccuracy.

7. Whittaker's statement is as unfounded, that "Coverdale, assisted by Rogers who corrected the press, revised the whole of Tyndale's work, before they reprinted it."⁷

¹ A vertice ad calcem fidelissime in idioma vulgare transtulit.

⁴ Historical Account, &c., p. 73, reprinted in vol. III of Watson's Theological Tracts, London, 1842.

² Script. Illust., p. 676, Basil, 1557. He characterizes the Bible as "opus laboriosum, excellens, salubre, pium ac sanctissimum."

⁵ Historical View, &c., p. 34.

⁶ Key to the Old Testament, p. 18.

⁷ Enquiry, &c., p. 59, Cambridge,

³ Memorials of Cranmer, vol. I, 1819.

p. 185.

9. According to Walter, and his opinion was adopted by Hartwell Horne, Coverdale was the editor of Matthew's Bible, and he rejected as much of his own version as could be replaced from Tyndale's published or unpublished translations.¹ The statement about the authorship of the text is true, though Coverdale had no hand either in compiling or editing the Bible, as it was printed abroad, and Coverdale, who seems to have come back at or about the time of the publication of his own Bible, was during this period in England.²

Equally remote from fact is Hallam's statement,³ that the Bible of 1535 was the joint work of Tyndale and Coverdale, and that a new edition of it appeared in 1537 under the name of Matthew. The first opinion being baseless, the last of course falls to the ground; and though it is true that the edition of 1537 did consist of Tyndale's and Coverdale's version, yet they were not so joined together in 1535.

Froude⁴ also conjectures the entire Old Testament to be Tyndale's work, "done by him personally, or done under his superintendence"; but the assertion is contradicted by all that is known of the martyr's life, and by the character of the translation of the Historical Books found in the Bible of 1535, and in that of 1537. It is also incorrect to talk, as Colonel Chester does, of the New Testament "of Rogers' version," since, as far as the text is concerned, he only reprinted Tyndale. Cranmer might be pardoned for calling it "a new translation," and "a new print"; but such inadvertence is now without apology.

¹ Letters to the Right Reverend years." Remains, Parker Society, Herbert, Lord Bishop of Peterborough, p. 301, London, 1823. pp. 525-6.

² On the 26th of March, 1548, Coverdale writes from Frankfort, to Calvin, about his speedy return to England, "after an exile of eight years." Remains, Parker Society, pp. 525-6.

³ Constitutional History of England, vol. I, p. 83, seventh edition, London, 1854.

⁴ History of England, vol. III, p. 78, fourth edition, London, 1867.

CHAPTER XXII.

ALL those extraordinary statements in the previous paragraphs may be easily set aside by the briefest collation. The simple fact is, that the Bible of Matthew or Rogers was a composite volume made up of the translations of Tyndale and Coverdale. Tyndale had already published the Pentateuch, and during the remaining years of his life he must have been quietly and vigorously engaged in the prosecution of his great work—the translation of the entire Old Testament. From his cold and dark prison he made a special request for a little light and for his "Hebrew Bible, Hebrew grammar, and Hebrew dictionary," that he might spend his time in the study and translation of the Hebrew Scriptures.¹ We can scarcely suppose that his small request, so feelingly urged, was denied; and we can picture him during the long nights of winter poring over these volumes by the miserable, blinking flame of a candle, that did little more than make the darkness visible, while the morning sunbeams, feebly straggling through the narrow grated windows, might not supply a much better light to the crouching industrious student. The general belief is, that he had translated to the end of 2 Chronicles, and he may have left papers containing first copies of other books. Probably Rogers had been initiated into the work by Tyndale, and had acquired such a love for it that he resolved to republish what the martyr had already printed, and to issue at the same time what he possessed of his unfinished task. Tyndale's "books and other things" were seized on his arrest, but important manuscripts might in these hazardous times have been

¹ See page 211.

secured from harm, and deposited in some secret place of safety, known to Rogers or Mr. Poyntz. The portion of the Old Testament, from Joshua to Ezra, is undeniably not Coverdale's version, and at the end of Malachi stand in large ornamented capitals the letters W. T.—William Tyndale. But the part from 2 Chronicles onward to the conclusion of the Old Testament, including Jonah, is beyond doubt Coverdale's translation. Rogers did not insert the Epistles from the Old Testament according to the use of Sarum, which are appended to Tyndale's New Testament of 1534. The Epistles taken from the historical books differ from the corresponding sections of Matthew's Bible, and apparently they formed the basis of a revision made by the translator himself; but those taken from the Prophets and the Apocrypha are completely ignored, and the version of Coverdale is used.

No small presumption in favour of the tradition that Tyndale translated from Joshua to 2 Chronicles is afforded by the fact that these books are translated, according to Tyndale's wont, from the Hebrew text. The assertion may be verified by the comparison of any chapter, or even of any verse. Thus:—

TYNDALE AFTER THE HEBREW.	COVERDALE, AS USUAL, DIRECTLY FROM THE ZÜRICH BIBLE.
Josh. i, 1. which I give (Heb. pres. participle).	I have given. ¹
4. the river Euphrates toward the going down of the sun.	the water Euphrates. ² toward the west. ³
ix, 14. the men took of their victuals.	the captain ⁴ took.
xii, 1. the river Arnon.	the water of Arnon.
2. the river Jabbok the plain.	water of Jabbok. the plain field. ⁵
xxiv, 21. elders that overlived Joshua.	lived long after Joshua. ⁶

These are slight, but satisfactory, specimens in favour of Tyndale, and Coverdale cannot for a moment be suspected.

¹ Ich geben hab.

² Wasser.

³ Gegen den Abend.

⁴ Hauptleut.

⁵ Flach völd.

⁶ Lange zeyt laebtend nach Josua.

Besides, not a few characteristic renderings in Tyndale's Pentateuch are found in the Historical Books. "Timbrel" is the uniform translation of a Hebrew term in the Pentateuch, and also in the Historical Books; but Coverdale has "tabret." Lebanon is the form found in the Pentateuch, and also in the Historical Books; Coverdale preferring Libanus. "Ephod" is the translation in the Pentateuch, and is carried into the Historical Books; Coverdale employing "overbody cote." "Ark of the covenant of the Lord" is Coverdale's favourite phrase in the Pentateuch and Historical Books, but Tyndale has often in the Pentateuch, "Ark of the Testament," and this rendering is employed also in the Historical Books; while "Ark of the appointment of the Lord" is in both collections of books, and both phrases occur in Joshua iii and iv. A substantive rendered "tribulation" in Deut. iv, 30, has the same rendering in 2 Samuel xxii, 7, and in 2 Chron. xv, 4, Coverdale having "strately troubled" and "in trouble." Another peculiar phrase, rendered "prisoned and forsaken" in Deut. xxxii, 36, is "in prison and forsaken" in 1 Kings xiv, 10, and "prysoned and forsaken" in 1 Kings xxi, 21—Coverdale having in the first instance "shut up and remained over," and in the second, "the prisoner and forsaken." Coverdale carefully consulted Tyndale's Pentateuch, and therefore proofs taken from identity of renderings in the Mosaic and in the Historical Books are so far obliterated when they are also found in the Pentateuch of the Bible of 1535. Coverdale preferred Tyndale's translation in cases where he was at liberty to select other terms; as in Deut. xiv, 5, Tyndale (Matthew) having, "ye shall eate no maner of abhominacyon—these are the beastes which ye shall eate of, oxen, shepe, and gootes, hart, roo, and bugle, hartgoote, unicorn, origin, and camelion,"¹ Matthew altering hart into wild. The last three terms are in our version, wild ox, pygarg, and chamois. But in Leviticus xi, 22, Tyndale has "Even of these ye may eat, the arbe and all hys kynde, the selaam with all hys kynde, the hargol and all his kynde, the

¹ "Bugle" is büffel in Luther, being some kind of antelope. All "origin" is Aurochs, the Septuagint these terms seem to denote animals having ὄρυξ, the word so rendered of that species.

COLLATION—Continued.

Ch.	Ver.								
12	40	'34	...	...	under colour of long	GH '35	M	under a colour of long	
—	43	'34	GH	...	M and he called unto him	...	'35	...	and he calleth unto him
13	4	'34	GH	...	M when all these things	...	'35	...	when all things
—	11	'34	GH	...	M but whatsoever is given	...	'35	...	whatsoever is given
—	—	'34	GH	...	M same time that speak	...	'35	...	same time that that speak
—	13	'34	GH	...	M but whosoever shall	...	'35	...	but whoever shall
—	17	'34	...	...	woe is then to them	GH '35	M	woe shall be then to them	
—	22	'34	...	...	false Christs shall arise	GH '35	M	false Christs shall rise	
—	30	'34	...	...	till all these things	GH '35	M	till these things	
—	34	'34	GH	...	M and hath left his house	...	'35	...	and had left his house
14	2	'34	...	'35	M arise among the people	GH	...	...	arise among people
—	45	'34	GH	...	M Master Master and kissed	...	'35	...	Master and kissed
—	63	'34	GH	...	M then the highest priest	...	'35	...	then the high priest
—	—	'34	GH	...	M rent his clothes and said	...	'35	...	rent his clothes and say
—	64	'34	GH	...	M all gave sentence	...	'35	...	all have sentence
—	—	'34	GH	'35	...	...	M	...	have heard blasphemy
15	15	'34	GH	...	M to be crucified	...	'35	...	to crucified
—	19	'34	GH	'35	...	...	M	...	omitted
—	29	'34	GH	...	M destroyest the temple...	...	'35	...	destroyed the temple
—	41	'34	...	...	with him to Jerusalem	...	'35	...	with unto Jerusalem
—	—	...	GH	...	M with him unto Jerusalem	...			
—	46	'34	GH	'35	...	of the rock and rolled a	...	M	omitted
—	—	—	—	—	stone unto the door	...			
16	11	'34	...	...	and when they heard	GH '35	M	and though they heard	
—	—	'34	...	...	and he had appeared	GH '35	M	and had appeared	
—	—	'34	...	...	they believed it not	GH '35	M	yet they believed it not	
—	15	'34	GH	...	M, preach the glad tidings	...	'35	...	preach the gladder tidings
—	17	'34	...	...	and these signs	...	GH '35	M	and these things
—	19	'34	...	...	and is set down	...	GH '35	M	and sat him down

These component parts being gathered into one volume by John Rogers, two-thirds of Matthew's Bible are, therefore, Tyndale's, and one-third is Coverdale's. Tyndale had done his work "in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses"; his name had been "cast out as evil"; King Henry had hated him; Sir Thomas More had employed all his learning, eloquence, and wit to hold up his version to malediction and scorn; Crumwell had frowned upon him; Tunstall had made a goodly bonfire of his volumes; Longland's heart had been rejoiced by the secret simultaneous search for them in the capital and the two universities; Stokesley had sent men to the flames for reading them; the translator himself had been proscribed, "Judasly betrayed" by English agents, and burned; but in less than a year

after his martyrdom, his translation acquired the royal right of free sale and dispersion, having been mysteriously accepted as forming the larger portion of an Authorized Version for the English people.¹

¹Tyndale's last prayer at the stake in "to the country "by the solemn contradict's Mr. Froude's assertion will of the king." No royal license (vol. iv, p. 84) that the translator was issued for Bibles till 1537—the had lived to see the Bible "borne year after Tyndale's martyrdom.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE work of Rogers in the production of this Bible was, however, something more than the mechanical putting together of its various portions, and the superintending of the press. The preliminary matter is characteristic. As has been already said, besides the general preface, and dedication, and the "exhortacyon to the studye of the Holy Scripture, gathered out of the Bible," at the end of which stand the initials I. R., there follows also, on two pages, the "summe and content of all the Holy Scripture, both of the Olde and the Newe Testament," a brief system of theology. These two prefatory essays were retained in the great Bible of 1539. Then there comes a "table of the pryncypal matters conteyned in the Byble, in which the readers may fynde and practyse many commune places," and prefaced by an address to the "Christen reders," which opens, "As the bees dylygently do gather together the swete flowers to make by naturall craft the swete honey, so haue I done the pryncypall sentences conteyned in the Byble. The whych are ordered after the maner of a table, for the consolacyon of those whych are not yet exercised and instructed in the holy Scripture. In the which are many harde places, as well of the olde as of the newe Testament expounded, gathered together, concorded, compared one wyth another; to thintent that the prudent Reader (by the sprete of God) maye beare awaye pure and cleare vnderstanyng. Wherby euery man (as he is bounde) maye be made ready, stronge, & garnysed, to answere to all them that aske hym a reason of hys fayth. Thys is also profytable for the partycular & generall exhortacyons whych we make to certayne person-

ages, or commune people: & for to answere truly to Heretykes, & to confounde the aduersaries of the worde of God. In the which also we may fynde (that which helpeth greatly the studye of the readers) the openyng of certayne Hebrewe tropes, translacyons, symylytudes, and maners of speakynges (whych we call phrases) conteyned in the Byble. And for the more easely to fynde the matters desyred (because that dysorder engendreth confusyon), I haue proceded after the order of an alphabete: to thyntente that none be depriued of so precyous a treasure: the whych ye shall vse to the honoure & glorye of God, and to the edyfyinge of hys Church. How be it (good Reader) yf thou fynde not the thynges in thys table expressed, in the same letters of the chapters wherin they are assynged; vouchsaue to loke in the letter goinge next before or in the letter next folowyng." The table fills twenty-six folio pages, and being alphabetically arranged, it forms a species of concordance and dictionary—one of the earliest in the language. Great pains were employed in drawing it up, and its scriptural fulness and accuracy are to be admired. It is not, however, original, but is taken chiefly from the French Bible of Olivetan. Texts of Scripture are uniformly given to these 220 articles, in order to illustrate, confirm, or improve practically what has been said, and the Apocrypha is freely used. Scripture is compared with Scripture. Thus, under the word Angels: ¹ The angels assyste before God, Job xxv *a*, and xxxviii *a*, Daniel vii *e*, Matt. xviii; and do minister to men, Ps. civ *a*, Heb. i. Also they do rebuke sinners, Judges ii *a*, and do comfort the afflycte, Genesis xxi *b*, Luke xxii *es*, Dan. vi *f*. Also they do teach the ignoraunte, example of ye angel which taught Elijah, what he should say to the seruantes of Ohoziah, iv Re. i *a*, also of Dan. ix *f*, also of Joseph, Matt. i. ii, *d*, also of Cornelius, Acts x *a*, also of Zechariah, Luke i. By the angelles God scourgeth his people, ii Re. xxiv, iv Re. xix *g*, Act vii *d*. Aduocate—Note that I fynde not in all the Byble this word aduocate, but only in i Jo. ii *a*, in ye which place is said that Christ is our aduocate towarde the father."

¹ There are, of course, no verses alphabet indicate the section in marked, and the letters of the which the passages may be found.

Some of the notes have a distinct reference to popery. Under Beatitude occurs, with a hand pointing to it, "blessed is Mary because she beleued," Luke i e. Masse, thys worde masse is not in the Byble translated by S. Jerom, nor in none other that we haue. And therefore, could I not tel what to note therof, but to sende the reader to the souper of oure Lorde Jesus Christe, i Corinthians xi, Act xx b c. Meryte—In lokyng over the Byble, as well the newe as the olde Testament, I haue not founde this word meryte. Meryte then is nothyng; for to meryt is to bynd God vnto his creatures, and not to obserue the meryte of Jesus Christ, by which only we are saued; not accordyng to oure workes or merytes, but according to his holy purpose and grace, which was geuen vnto vs before al time. ii Tim. i b, Titus iv b: It is then by grace that we are saued through fayth, and not of vs, but by the gyft of God to thyntent that none do boast hym selfe, Ephe. ii, Roma. iii, 2. For the tribulacyons of thys world, are not worthye of the glorie that shal be shewed vnto vs, Rom, viii. And if we haue pacyence in them, that cometh of God, i Cor iv. Howe then can we glorie that we do meryte that thyng which is none of ours in as much as God doth and accomplysheth in vs the good wil, Phil. ii. Religion for obseruing (not of cloister rules), but of thynges ordayned of God, Exo. xii d, Leue. viii g, Num. xix d, religion for the sect of the Pharises which were proud Ipocrites and ful of ceremonies, of which S. Paul was at the fyrste, Act xxvi b. Cornelius being captaine of the Italian's army, is called a religious man, and yet he had made no monastycall vowes, Act x a. The true religion of the Christen standeth not in the dyuersitye of habytes or of vowes; but in visitynge of the fatherlesse and wydowes in their tribulacyons and kepyng a man's selfe pure from the wickedness of this world, James i.

Rogers did not translate, nor did he attempt a thorough revision. But he went over the whole carefully, making a few unimportant changes, and adding several alternate renderings, found among the notes, and introduced by the formula, "Some reade"—thus, in Isaiah iii, 3, the text has "master of craftes," and the notes have, Some reade "exactours or extor-

tioners." Isaiah viii, 14, text, "to stumble at, the rock to fall upon, a snare and net to both the houses to Israel, and the inhabitours of Jerusalem." Notes, Some reade, "and as the rock to fall upon the two houses of Israel, a snare and net to the inhabitours of Jerusalem," after Luther. In Prov. i, 1, Coverdale has "These are the Proverbes of Salomon," and in Isaiah i, 1, "This is the Prophecy of Esay," both after Luther; but Rogers gives more literally, "The Proverbs of Solomon," "The Prophecy of Esay," after the Vulgate and Pagninus. The change, however, in these places is accidental, for similar diction is found in the beginning of other books, as in the opening words of Jeremiah, Hosea, Joel, Amos, &c., where Luther's usual formula, repeated in the Zürich Bible, and translated by Coverdale, remains unchanged. Coverdale had followed the numeration of the Psalms as given in the Vulgate, noting at the head of the tenth Psalm, "here the Hebrues begine the x Psalm," making the next as the x also; but in this Bible the numeration corresponds generally with the Hebrew. Rogers omits three verses in Psalm xiv, which, "not being in the Hebrew," according to Coverdale's marginal note, were yet inserted by him. Coverdale does not translate the word given in our version, "to the chief musician," but Rogers always renders it, "to the chaunter." Coverdale at the beginning of a book, such as Isaiah, gives the contents of all the chapters together; Rogers prefixes them to each separate chapter, and at the end of the chapter come the annotations, headed as "the notes." He ends 2 Kings with the conclusion of the reign of Jehoshaphat, in our version xxii, 50. In the "Ballet of Ballettes of Salomon," he gives an interpretation of the poem, and the various scenes are distinguished as "the voyce of the Church," "the spousesse to her companions," "the voyce of the Church in persecution," "Christ to the Synagogue," "the voyce of the Patriarch speaking of Christ," &c., shorter notes occurring on the margin of Olivetan. In the use of such notes on Canticles, Matthew had been preceded by Hereford, the early colleague of Wycliffe—"the Church of the comynge of Christ speketh, the voice of the Fader, &c.," but Purvey removed such headings.

The title to the Apocrypha, adorned with fifteen woodcuts,

is, "The volume of the bokes called Apocrypha conteyned in the comen translation in Latyne, which are not found in the Hebrue, nor in the Chalde." Coverdale had omitted the prayer of Manasses, but Rogers inserted it before 1 Maccabees, from Olivetan's French version, such terms and phrases as "ornament," "laudable," "vertu," "importable," "requiring goodness of thee," "knowing iniquity," "all the vertue of heaven," being directly transferred from the French text. Baruch was placed next to Jeremiah by Coverdale; but here it is inserted between Ecclesiasticus and "the Song of the Three Children in the Oven." Though there are headings, there are no continuous notes to the Apocrypha; and his first and general preface, which is translated from Olivetan, is a distinct and positive protest against the reception of the books of the Apocrypha as an inspired collection—as follows:

"In consyderacyon that the bokes before are founde in the Hebrue tonge, receaued of all men: & that the other folowyng, which are called Apocripa (because they were wont to be reade, not openly & in comen, but as it were in secret & aparte) are nether founde in the Hebrue nor in the Chalde: in which tonges they haue not of longe bene written (in lesse then it were happly the boke of Sapience) wher vpon it were now very harde to repayre & amende them: And that also they are not receaued nor taken as legyttymate & leafull, as well of the Hebrues as of the whole Church, as S. Hierome sheweth: we haue separat them, & sett them asyde, that they may the better be knowen: to thintent that men may knowe of which bokes witnes ought to be receaued, & of which not. For the sayde S. Hierome speakeinge of the boke of Judith (which is Apocriphe) sayth, that the autorytye therof is not esteamed worthy & suffycient to confyrme & stablysh the thynges that lyght in disputacyon. And generally of all the bokes called Apocripa, he sayth, that men maye reade them to the edyfyng of the people: but not to confyrme & strengthen the doctryne of the Church. I leaue oute here the lawe (as they call it) of Canon. c. Sancta Romana. xv. distinc. where he sheweth his iudgement. Lykewyse the Glose of c. Canones. xvj. distinc. which sayth, that men reade them, but not in

generall: as though he shulde saye, that generally & thorouly they are not alowed. And not wythout a cause: For that they haue bene corrupted & falsyfyed in many places, it appeareth sufficiently by Eusebius in his boke called *Historia Ecclesiastica*: Which thinge is easye to be known even now a dayes in certen poyntes, namely in the bokes of the Machabees: whose second boke S. Hiero. confesseth that he founde not in the Hebrue, by the meanes wherof it is become vnto vs the more suspect & the lesse receaued. In lyke maner is it of the thyrd & fourthe boke of Esdras, which S. Hierome protesteth that he wolde not haue translated, esteamyng them for dreames: where as Josephus yet in his boke of his *Antiquities* declarcth the summe of the matter after the maner of a storye, as well of the boke of Machabees as of the .iiij. of Esdras: although he esteame the bokes compyled from the raygne of Kynge Artaxerses vnto hys tyme, to be Apocripa.

"Wherefore then, when thou wylt manteyne any thyng for certen, rendryng a reason of thy fayth, take heade to proceade therin by the lyuynge and pyththye Scriptures folowinge S. Peter, which sayth: He that speaketh, let hym speake as though he spake the worde of God."

On the other hand, Coverdale, after saying that "the Apocryphal Books are judged among the doctours to be of like reputation with the other Scripture," quietly adds, "I have not gathered them together to the intent that I wolde have them despised or little set by, or that I should think them false, for I am not able to prove it." He had also said that, between the translations, "repentance," penance or amendment, "there was no more difference than between fourpence and a groat." Rogers was not of that opinion, and he felt that the translation "do penance" might be understood in the Romish sense of self-inflicted physical pain—suffered to make satisfaction. The Notes at the end of the chapters are of all kinds—textual, doctrinal, polemical, and practical¹—and they almost form a running

¹ Colonel Chester calls these notes of Tyndale's notes," but he forgets the first general English Commentary. that we have only a very small fragment of Tyndale's annotated quarto—In proof he urges that "Mr. Walter could gather only nine octavo pages New Testament.

comment. They were gathered from various sources; many are from Pellicanus, and others appear to be original. Some learning is displayed, as an allusion to the Chaldee interpreter, Job vi. Strabo is cited under Matth. ii, to show that the Magi were the priests of the Persians. Neginoth, Shiggaion, &c., are carefully explained. There is (Matt. ii) a reference to a saying of Augustus, preserved in Macrobius, that "he would rather be Herod's swine than his sonne." Josephus is quoted at 3 Kings vii, and in the margin of Num. xxxiii, 52, two rabbis are adduced for the alternate rendering "paving stones." Under Luke x, the sister of Martha is called Mary Magdalene. The Psalms are formally divided into five "Treatyses" or books, a distinction not recognized by Coverdale. Hallelujah is explained as meaning "praise the Everlasting." Under Job i, 21, Coverdale's parenthesis, based on the Vulgate, "the Lord hath done his pleasure" is omitted, and this note is added, "the Greek and Origen adds, Hereunto as it hath pleased the Lord, so it is done." A song of degrees is called "a song of the stearis," that is, stairs. Selah is thus explained at the end of Psalm iii, "this worde, after Rabbi Kimchi, was a sygne or token of lyftynge up the voyce, and also a monission and advertisement to enforce the thoughte and mynde earnestly to give hede to the meanyng of the verse whereunto it is added. Some will that it sygnifye perpetuallye or verily." At Gen. ii, 17, such idioms as "die the death" are termed "rehearsalls of words." The note at the end of 2 Maccabees xii is, "Judge from the place whether the opinion hath been to pray for the dead, as to be baptized for them; 1 Cor. xv, *d*, which thing was only done to confirm the hope of the resurrection of the dead, not to deliver from any pain. . . . This hole book of the Maccabees, and specially this second, is not of sufficient authority to make an article of our faith."

It follows, from the previous statements about the component parts of this Bible, that the assertion on its title-page—"The Scriptures truly and purely translated into English, by Thomas Matthew"—is not to be taken in literal accuracy, for Thomas Matthew did not himself translate; he simply joined

together, edited, and published two translations. But he knew that the language could impose on no one, as thousands were in possession of Tyndale's Testament and Coverdale's Bible, the only two versions which he employed in making up the new volume. It was an act of splendid audacity on the part of Mr. Richard Grafton, "citizen and grocer," to send such a volume to the Archbishop of Canterbury—a volume made up so largely of Tyndale's version, which had been so fiercely proscribed a few years before, which had the initials of his name blazoned in large capital letters, and which in its critical notes did not veil his opinions, but rather presented them in an intensified form, and which, going greatly beyond Cranmer's own views, was a trenchant protest against Catholic doctrines and usages.

Strype gives the following brief account of some of the anti-papal notes:¹—

¶ "One of these notes fixeth us in the year of the edition—viz., Mark i. Upon those words, *What new doctrine is this?* the note in the margin is, 'That that was then *new*, after xv.c.xxxvi. years, is yet *new*. When will it then be old?' This note was made to meet with the common reproach then given to the religion reformed, that it was a *new* upstart religion, and called *the new learning*. Another marginal note was at Matthew xxv, *And the wise answered, Not so, lest there be not enough, &c.*, where the note is, *Note here, that their own good works sufficed not for themselves; and therefore remained none to be distributed unto their fellows: against works of supererogation, and the merits of saints.* And Matthew xvi, *I say unto thee, that thou art Peter: and upon this rock, &c.* The note is, *That is, as saith St. Austin, upon the confession which thou hast made, knowing me to be Christ, the Son of the living God, I build my congregation or church.* And again, *I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven.* The note is, Origen, writing upon Matthew, in his first homily affirmeth, *that these words were as well spoken to all the rest of the Apostles as to Peter.* And proves it, in that Christ, John xx, saith, *Receive the Holy Ghost. Whose sins soever ye remit, &c., and not thou remittest.* And Matthew xviii, *Whatsoever ye*

¹ Memorials of Cranmer, vol. I, pt. i, p. 472.

bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye loose on earth, &c. Margin, Whatsoever ye bind, &c., is, Whatsoever ye condemn by my word in earth, the same is condemned in heaven. And what ye allow by my word in earth is allowed in heaven. These and such like notes and explications, giving offence, no doubt, to the Popish Bishops, when the Bible was printed again (which was in the year 1540), all was left out."

CHAPTER XXIV.

NO sooner had this Bible come into the country, probably toward the end of July, 1537, than Cranmer was brought into immediate connection with it. On 4th August he sent a letter to Crumwell, telling him of its appearance, and asking him "to rede it"—"a new translation and a new print," praising it and adding, "As for the translation, so farre as I have redde thereof, I like it better than any other translacion heretofore made: And forasmoche as the boke is dedicated unto the Kinges Grace, & also greate paynes & labour taken in setting forth of the same, I pray you, my lorde, that you will exhibite the boke into the Kinges Highnes: & to obteign of His Grace, if you can, a license that the same may be sold & redde of every person, withoute danger of any acte, proclamacion, or ordinaunce heretofore graunted to the contrary, untill such tyme that we, the Bisshops, shall set forth a better translacion—which I thinke will not be till a day after Domes-day."¹ These last bitter words were inspired by the memory of his failure in 1534. What the archbishop requested was done, and on the 13th of August, Cranmer sends a letter of hearty thanks to the great statesman for having so promptly secured the royal license: "My lorde for this your payne taken in this behalf, I giue vnto you my most hartie thanks, assurying your lordship for the contentacion of my mynde, you have shewed me more pleasure herein than yf you hadd giuen me a thowsande pownde."² This second letter is dated 28th day of August, and on that day Grafton himself writes to Crumwell,

¹ State Papers, vol. I, pt. 11, p. 562. ² Cotton MSS., Cleo., E. V. fol. 329.

and also sends a present of six Bibles. His words imply that he was aware of Cranmer's first epistle of thanks.¹ In a third letter, dated Ford, 28th of the same month, the archbishop blesses Crumwell for his kind interposition with the king, and promises him "laud and memory of all God's faithfull people—nay, this deede you shall hear of at the Great Day."² Cranmer might have had no leisure for a collation, but probably Crumwell was aware of the component materials of the Bible; and had Henry looked into the volume, which, at the request of his minister, he had licensed, he might have seen that he was stultifying himself in a most marvellous way, for he might at once have recognized the work of Tyndale, so often denounced; even the prologue to Romans, which had been formally singled out and proscribed, was retained and placed in prominence. But, probably from his knowledge of public opinion, he took the bold step of granting the royal sanction to this Bible. The royal proclamation to be read by all the curates was in the following terms:³—

"Whereas it hath pleased the king's majesty, our most dread sovereign, and supreme head under God of this Church of England, for a declaration of the great zeal he beareth to the setting forth of God's word, and to the virtuous maintenance of the commonwealth, to permit and command the Bible, being translated into our mother tongue, to be sincerely taught by us the curates, and to be openly laid forth in every parish church: to the intent that all his good subjects, as well by reading thereof, as by hearing the true explanation of the same, may be able to learn their duties to Almighty God and his majesty, and every of us charitably to use other: and then applying themselves to do according to that they shall hear and learn, may both speak and do Christianly; and in all things as it beseemeth Christian men: because his highness very much desireth, that this thing being by him most godly begun and set forward, may of all you be received as is aforesaid; his majesty hath willed and

¹ In this letter, Grafton, referring to Cranmer's remarks about the Bible giving him more pleasure than a gift of a thousand pounds, magnifies it into "ten thousand pounds." Strype's Cranmer, I, 131, &c.
² Ibid., fol. 292.
³ Cotton MSS., Cleop. E, p. 327.

commanded this to be declared unto you, that his grace's pleasure and high commandment is, that in the reading and hearing thereof, first most humbly and reverently using and addressing yourselves unto it, you shall have always in your remembrance and memories, that all things contained in this Book is the undoubted will, law, and commandment of Almighty God, the only and straight means to know the goodness and benefits of God towards us, and the true duty of every Christian man to serve him accordingly. And that therefore reading this Book with such mind and firm faith as is aforesaid, you shall first endeavour yourselves to conform your own livings and conversation to the contents of the same. And so by your good and virtuous example to encourage your wives, children, and servants to live well and Christianly according to the rules thereof.

"And if at any time by reading any doubt shall come to any of you touching the sense and meaning of any part thereof, that then, not giving too much to your own minds, fantasies, and opinions; nor having thereof any open reasoning in your open taverns or alehouses, ye shall have recourse to such learned men as be or shall be authorized to preach and declare the same. So that, avoiding all contentions and disputation in such alehouses and other places, unmeet for such conferences, and submitting your opinion to the judgments of such learned men as shall be appointed in this behalf, his grace may well perceive that you use this most high benefit quietly and charitably every one of you, to the edifying of himself, his wife, and family, in all things answering to his highness' good opinion conceived of you, in the advancement of virtue and suppressing of vice; without failing to use such discreet quietness and sober moderation in the premises as is aforesaid; as you tender his grace's pleasure, and intend to avoid his high indignation, and the peril and danger that may ensue to you and every of you for the contrary."

Peculiar decision and firmness are manifest in the movement. The "notes" in the volume sounded a bold defiance, and tended to exasperate thousands who were ready to rebel and battle for the faith and the rites of their fathers. The Pilgrimage of Grace

had recently alarmed the nation, and this wild reactionary rebellion in the north was fed and fostered by fanatical priests, clamouring for the suppression of all ecclesiastical reforms, and plunging into treason to avenge themselves of heresy. Aske had been executed, and also the Abbot of Barlings, who had unfolded the Banner of the Five Wounds. Not long after this, when the treason of the Poles, one of whom had been made a cardinal, was detected and punished, such men as were forward to show hostility to the crown on pretence of helping the church were stigmatized by the king himself as "those miserable papistical and superstitious wretches."¹ The licensing of Matthew's Bible at such a time—a volume so profuse in its civil homage, and so terse and pointed in its condemnation of papal dogmas and rites—appeared to be throwing down the gauntlet to a great and turbulent faction.

Crumwell had now risen to the pinnacle of power and prerogative. He had become Vicar-General and Vicegerent, officially representing the king as the head of the Church; and in virtue of this anomalous office, he presided in Convocation. Such presiding of "an ignorant layman in a synod of the most learned bishops that ever were in England was a most scandalous sight," according to Bishop Godwin.

At a meeting of Convocation in 1536, the vicegerent, who took precedence of the archbishop, introduced, by a wanton stretch of authority, Ales, or Alane, the Scottish exile,² and a sufferer from popish tyranny, and asked him to declare his judgment on the question of the Sacraments. Ales confined himself chiefly to arguments from Scripture, for Bishop Foxe, of Hereford, had encouraged him by these words: "We be commanded by the king's grace to dispute by the Holy Scripture. . . . The lay people now know the Holy Scriptures better than many of us." As Ales went on in his Biblical demonstration, Stokesley shouted in a paroxysm of wrath, "Yet are ye far deceived if ye think that there is none other Word of God

¹ In a circular letter to the justices book "On the Authority of the Word of the peace. Burnet's Collectanea, of God," he gave his name as Alexander Alane, Scot. p. 494.

² See page 247. On the title of a

but that which every souter and cobbler doth read in his mother tongue." One of the strong protestations of the Lower House also was, that now "by preaching the people have been brought in opinion and belief that nothing is to be believed except it can be proved expressly from Scripture." These varieties of opinion, and these confessions, wrung from alarmed opponents, showed that the Bible had been getting among the people, who were still eager for a fuller and more public circulation of it. Might not the king, understanding this state of feeling among his subjects, feel warranted to follow the advice of his prime counsellor, and give his royal sanction to the Bible of Coverdale and to the Bible of Matthew? Both Bibles received the royal license in the same year, but which of them had the priority cannot be definitely decided. Fulke, however, writing in 1583, calls "Thomas Matthew's translation the first that was printed in English with authority."¹

The Dedication, which occupies no less than three pages, must also have had some influence in gaining the royal consent. It takes up such topics as Coverdale had done—not, however, comparing his majesty to the Jewish kings, but rather, in a firm and manly tone, holding up their life and work, as royal examples. But he adds, quite in the fashion of the age: "The want of lernynge, The obscuresnes & lownes of byrth, The lack of youre graces knowledge, &c., shuld haply haue vtterly forbydden me, to haue interprysed the dedycacion herof to so puyssaient a Prynce: But the experience of youre graces benygnytye, wherthroughe youre prayse is renouined & hyghly magnified, even amōge straungers & alyentes, not alone among youre awne subiectes, The Godly moderacion of youre heuenly polycye, wherwith ye suppress supersticyon & mayntene true holynes, inflameth me to some part of boldnes: Specyally syth the thyng which I dedycate is soch as your grace studyeth dayly to foster." And he thus concludes: "The euerliuynge Lord so prospere contynually youre begonne purpose vnto soch effect, that the thinge may be which ye haue begōne. And double vnto you the addycyō of yeares that was geuen vnto Hezekiah, ouer & above those that ye shulde naturally lyue,

¹ Defence, &c., against Gregory Martin, p. 112, Parker Society ed.

that ye maye the better accomplysh your moast godly intent: And blesse you at thys present wyth a sonne, by youre most gracyous wyfe Queen Jane, which may prosperously & fortunately raygne, & folowe the godly steppes of his father: And after your grace shall geue place to nature, & forsake thys mortall lyfe, grannte you the rewarde of that vnspeakable & celestyall ioye, whych no eye hath sene, no eare hearde, nor can ascende into the herte of man. So be it. Your grace faythfull & true subiect—Thomas Matthew."

Different views have been taken of the connection of Cranmer with Matthew's Bible; some conjecturing that he was wholly ignorant of the preparation of it, and others that its importation did not take him by surprise—nay, Lewis affirms that he was one of its "curators," and Todd, "that he had exerted himself for it." Certainly, his letter to Crumwell indicates no emotion produced by any sudden discovery, nor does it hint at any prior knowledge of the enterprise, but it speaks quietly of a mere welcome matter of fact. There may have been a prior understanding, though no hint of it is dropped. Grafton and Whitechurch may have secretly informed Cranmer of their purpose, in the hope of securing his protection. Grafton had embarked his fortune in it, £500 sterling, a sum probably equal in value to £7,000 at the present day, and he was naturally anxious to be repaid. Would he have ventured without some tacit connivance with Cranmer to have brought the Bible into the country under the risk of its circulation being refused or impeded, and himself financially ruined? That neither the archbishop nor the printers spoke of the matter prematurely was only a natural silence in the circumstances. Though Cranmer seized the first opportunity of turning Crumwell's attention to the new Bible, neither he nor the vicegerent had been at any expense or trouble about it, and it was not fostered or printed under any distinguished patronage.

The edition of 1500 copies was soon exhausted, and Grafton, afraid of competition, petitioned Crumwell, Lord Privy Seal, for protection. He had already asked for a royal license, which had been granted; but he was aware of what had happened to Tyndale through pirated editions, undertaken by illiterate

foreigners, ignorant of the very language which they were printing. He pleads the amount of capital embarked in the enterprise, and the popularity of the book as tempting others to republish it,—“There are that will, and doth go about the printing of the same worke agayne in a lesser letter, to the intent that they may sell their little books better cheap than I can sell these great, to the utter undoing of me, your orator, and all these my creditors.” He tries to frighten his patron by the prophecy that rivals will falsify the text, and not set out the book for God's glory, as may appear by the former Bibles which they have set forth, which have neither good paper, letter, ink, nor correction. Especially was he afraid of “Douchemen (Germans) dwelling within the realm, who can neither speak good English, nor write none, who yet will both print and correct such an edition, and who are so covetous that they will not bestow twenty or forty pounds on a learned man as editor.” He calls himself a “poor young man” who will be ruined by such rival editions. Then he piously suggests, with a keen eye to business and to a rapid sale, that every abbey should have six copies, “that they may look on the Lord's law,” “none but those of the papistical sort,” however, being compelled to have them; and he concludes, “then I know there should be enough found in my lord of London's diocese to spend away a great part of them, and so should this be a godly act worthily to be had in remembrance while the world doth stand. The sicknes is bryme¹ about, or else I would wait upon your lordship.”² To this request, so simple in its terms, so cautious in its selfward suggestions, veiled, however, by such professions of disinterested patriotism, and Christian zeal, no response seems to have been made, at least none has been preserved. Yet, if the suspicions of Grafton were correct as to the contemplated reprint of the “dreaded lytle bookes,” the project seems to have been checked, perhaps by Crumwell's command. We should have rejoiced, however, at seeing a Bible of smaller form put into circulation for popular use, since, as long as it was kept in the shape of a

¹ Brime means fierce, as in Lang-

² Cotton MSS., Cleopatra E. V., fol. 340.

large and heavy folio, it could be possessed only by a mere fraction of the nation. The age of hand-bibles had not come, the period was one of transition, and men were still feeling toward a more perfect version. But a decided advance had now been made; for that Bible was now in the country which was to supply the basis of all subsequent revisions. The edition of Matthew or Rogers of 1537 became on revision the Great Bible in 1539-1540, it on revision took the name of the Bishops' Bible in 1568, and the Bishops' Bible, on being again revised, took its lasting place as our English Bible in 1611.

CHAPTER XXV.

A REVISED edition of Matthew's Bible was published in 1539. The editor, Richard Taverner, was born at Brisley, Norfolk, about 1505, and was one of the young men selected by Wolsey for his college at Oxford. He was imprisoned with others in its cellar for reading Tyndale's New Testament. But he was soon released on account of his singular musical accomplishments;¹ and giving himself to the study of law, he was admitted to the Inner Temple. He next attached himself to Secretary Crumwell, Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, and in 1537 occupied a position of honour and responsibility as clerk of the signet to the king. Two years afterwards, in 1539, his edition of the Bible appeared, and his connection with Crumwell may have suggested to him such a Biblical work. The title bears that it was "newly recognized with great diligence after most faythful exemplars."² The edition was printed in London, in folio and quarto,³ while the first Great Bible was at press on the Continent, and during the same year were issued two editions of the New Testament, in folio and quarto also.⁴ His New Testament was again printed in 1540 in 12mo, and his Old Testament formed part of a Bible published in 1551. After that period

¹ Dalaber says (see p. 166), "I stood in order that poorer people who at the quire door and heard Mr. Taverner play." could not purchase a whole Bible might be able to buy a fragment.

² Bale speaks of it as *recognitio seu potius versio*. De Illustr. Viris, p. 698.

⁴ Taverner also published in 1540 Postills on the Epistles and Gospels. Reprinted, ed. Cardwell, Oxford, 1841.

³ This edition was printed in parts 1841.

his edition sank into such neglect that it had no appreciable influence on any subsequent revision.

Taverner was reputed to be a good Greek scholar, "it being his humour to quote law in Greek." His Bible has a distinctive character of its own. The Old Testament is Matthew with some variations; many of the marginal notes are changed; and he closely followed Tyndale in the New Testament. He unfolds his purpose in his dedication to the king, and thanks him for licensing the Bible: "This one thing I dare well affirm, that amongst all your majesty's deservings . . . your highness never did thing more acceptable unto God, more profitable to the advancement of true Christianity, more unpleasant to the enemies of the same, and also to your grace's enemies, than when your majesty licensed and willed the most sacred Bible containing the unspotted and lively Word of God to be in the English tongue set forth to your highness' subjects.

Wherefore, the premises well considered, forasmuch as the printers hereof were very desirous to have the Bible come forth as faultless, and emendably as the shortness of time for the recognizing of the same would require, they desired me, for default of a better learned, diligently to overlook and peruse the whole copy, and in any case I should find any notable default that needed correction, to amend the same, according to the true exemplars, which thing according to my talent I have gladly done." He understood the difficulty and importance of translation: "It is a work of great difficulty so absolutely to translate the Holy Bible that it be faultless," that he "feared it could scarce be done of one or two persons, but rather required both a deeper conferring of learned wits together, and also a juster time and longer leisure." This edition has no woodcuts, and there are very few notes.

Taverner's¹ scholarship appears on every page in many

¹ Taverner had a license to preach from the pulpit of St. Mary's. Died from Edward VI, and did preach. 14th July, 1577. Bale, writing in Queen Elizabeth made him high sheriff of Oxford in 1569. In civilian costume, and with a sword by his side, he preached to the students of his alliterative conceits in his ser-

minute touches, for he does justice to the article, as in Gal. v, 27, "hath the husband." He often follows the Greek order of expression, and is eager to find Saxon equivalents and idioms for rarer terms and combinations. Some of his alterations are pithy in character—Matt. xxii, 12, "had never a word to say"; 34, "stopped the Sadducees' mouths." But the clause "this cup is the New Testament in my blood," 1 Cor. xi, is omitted, and some copies have a slip of paper with the omitted words pasted over the place. The disputed clauses, 1 John v, are printed in a smaller type. In Gen. xliii, 11, the older phrase of Tyndale and Coverdale, "a curtesye baulme," is altered into "a quantity of baulme"; but he retains another archaism in Acts xii, 19, "commanded the keepers to depart"—to be put to death. The very peculiar term in 2 Kings xxiii, 5, Kemurims in Coverdale, Taverner changed into "religious persons"; the Great Bible having "ministers of Baal"; the Genevan, "Chemerim," with a note as in the original Matthew. The Authorized Version has, in the place referred to, "idolatrous priests"; in Hosea x, 5, simply "priests"; but in Zeph. i, 4, it has "Chemarims." Taverner, in his usual English, prefers "residue" to "remnant," and "forthwith" to "by and bye." Some of his changes are kept in the Authorized Version, as "parables" for "similitudes"; "because of their unbelief," Matt. xiii, 58; "ninety and nine," xviii, 12; "lodged," xxi, 17; "throne," xxiii, 21; "of many shall wax cold," xxiv, 12; "a stranger," xxv, 35; "passover," xxvi, 17; "guilty of death," 66; "ye have a watch," xxvii, 65; "the Israel of God," Gal. vi, 16; "I stand in doubt of you," iv, 20¹²—last clause, "in a doubt," Tyndale and Matthew. Gal. iii, 6, is identical with this version, Tyndale having "ascribed," but he preserves the

mons: "Arrived at the mount of St. Mary's was then of stone, and a wooden pulpit was put in its place now stand, I have brought you some fine biscuits, baked in the oven of charity, carefully conserved for the chickens of the church, the sparrows of the spirit, and the sweet swallows of salvation." The pulpit of St. Mary's, on the stony stage where I during the chancellorship of Dr. John Owen. For his edition of the English Bible Taverner was imprisoned after Crumwell's death, but he was soon released.

wrong translation in iv, 25, "and bordereth on." Taverner gives no preface to the Apocrypha, and in the title of the anonymous epistle to the Hebrews he omits the name of St. Paul.

Some other editions of Matthew's Bible may also be glanced at. One of them is a reprint in 1549, the title being within the woodcut which had been used for Coverdale's version. The colophon records, "And nowe agayne accordyngly imprinted & fynessed the laste daye of Octobre, in the yeare of oure Lorde God MDXLIX, By Wylliam Hyll & Thomas Rainaldes, typographers." It is altogether a wretched production—the type bad, and the arrangement devoid of taste and accuracy. Another edition appeared during the same year, "now lately with greate industry & diligence recognised," the printers being John Daye, dwelling over Aldersgate, and William Seres, dwelling in Peter's Colledge; the colophon intimating that the volume was "fynished" in MDXLIX, and that "these bokes are to be solde by the lyttle conduyte in Chepesyde." The "Supputation" of the years and times from Adam unto Christ is signed by Edmund Becke, the editor of the volume, which is a reprint, with few variations, of the edition of 1537, though the title-page affirms "faythefully set furth according to the copy of Thomas Matthewes translacion." In the Apocalypse are twenty coarse small cuts, the majority of which have two lines of rhyme printed perpendicularly on each side of them—thus the xii figure has—

"Goddess chosen church travaileth here alwaye,
And bringeth forth Christ both night and daye."

and the xx figure—

"All flesh is killed with the two edged sword,
Which after the spirit is called Goddess Worde."

Another edition of 1551—Taverner's revised by Becke—contains the Third Book of Maccabees for the first time, while Third Esdras, Tobit, and Judith are of a new translation. An edition of Becke's Matthew came out in 1551, "printed by

Thomas Petyt, dwelling in Paul's Churcheyarde, at the sign of the Maydens heade, and dated vi day of May." Eight publishers were concerned in the enterprise; and the colophon at the end of the New Testament bears that it was "diligently perused and corrected and imprinted by Nicolas Hyll, dwelling in Saynct Johns Strete, at the coste and charges of certayne honest menne of the occupacion, whose names be upon their bokes." Matthew's New Testament was issued in 1548, with a Latin version side by side; and an edition of Tyndale's New Testament, with Matthew's notes, appeared during the same year.

After Edward VI ascended the throne, Rogers came home. He was in England in 1548, for his preface to his translation of Melancthon's "Weighing of the Interim" is dated 1st August, 1548, at London, "in Edward Whitechurch's house." Though he had been for years a "stranger in a strange land," and though his volume had now been superseded by the Great Bible, his work as editor of Matthew's Bible was not forgotten, for he was, on the 10th of May, 1550, presented simultaneously to the rectory of St. Margaret Moyses,¹ on the east side of Friday Street, and the vicarage of St. Sepulchre, London. The income of the last living was £440 in 1636, the incumbent's share being £180, and a parsonage. On the 24th of August, 1551, he was preferred to the prebendal stall of St. Pancras in St. Paul's, and to this stall the rectory of Chigwell in Essex was attached. He resigned St. Margaret Moyses seventeen days after he had become a prebendary. There were three stalls vacant at the time, and Grindal and Bradford were promoted by Ridley along with Rogers. The first escaped, and became Archbishop of Canterbury; but Bradford, Rogers, and their bishop perished in the flames. Rogers was also chosen by the dean and chapter to be divinity lecturer in St. Paul's, but he could have held this office for a very brief interval only, for he seems to have been admitted to it in June, 1553. The changes of that period produced strange results, for Gabriel Dunne, the

¹ It was destroyed in the great fire, church in Bread Street of this name and afterward the parish was annexed to that of St. Mildred. The

betrayed of Tyndale, occupied as prebendary the twelfth stall on the right hand of the choir, and Prebendary Rogers the sixth on the left.

The death of Edward VI was followed by dark days. Popery was re-established under Mary, and its earnest opponents, after a brief respite, were arrested and martyred. Bishop Gardiner, her chief counsellor, made it his policy to strike at the "head deer," and he began with an illustrious victim, singled out as a popular leader, and zealous and eloquent reformer, who, as he had been so long in the land of Luther, was believed to possess uncommon eagerness and intrepidity. In August, 1553, Rogers was ordered by the Lords of the Council to keep himself a prisoner in his house at Pauls. He remained for a long period in this confinement, and "spake with no man." He was at length sent to Newgate, and confined with thieves under a jailer named "Alexander Andrew, a strait man," according to Foxe, "and a right Alexander, a coppersmith indeed." On the 22nd of January, 1555, official proceedings against him commenced before the Privy Council, the Lord Chancellor Gardiner presiding. Gardiner seems to have abruptly demanded if he was willing, then and there, to abandon his new faith, and acknowledge the Papal creed and authority. . . . With true courage, he replied boldly that he recognized Christ as the only head of the Church, and declared his opinion that the Bishop of Rome—not the Pope—had no more or other authority in spiritual matters than any other of the numerous bishops then living. Then Gardiner, hastily imagining that he had already ensnared him, inasmuch as, in his Dedication of the Bible to King Henry VIII, he had addressed him as "the chief and supreme head of the Church of England," taunted him with the fact; and when Rogers, who was fully prepared for this objection, would have explained his meaning and shown that he was guilty of no inconsistency, the subject was turned into derision by the Bishops of Durham and Worcester; and Gardiner, refusing to listen to him, demanded again, still more peremptorily, a direct answer to his original question. Determined not to be brow-beaten, Rogers urged that neither he or the other bishops believed what they now required him to

avow, for they had not only preached the contrary doctrine for twenty years, but some of them had written books against it. There was so much truth in the assertion that Gardiner did not attempt to controvert it; but, in seeking to escape the consequences of its admission by one outlet, he fell instantly into a still more serious pit-fall, and alleged that he and others had been compelled, by means of the cruelties used towards them, to appear to consent to what was really against their consciences. Rogers promptly retorted that they were now endeavouring to force him to do violence to his conscience in a similar manner. . . . He continued his argument with the Lord Chancellor, who soon interrupted him again, and insisted upon a prompt reply to his first question. Finding that they were determined not to listen to him, he shortly responded in the negative, and asked permission to prove, in writing, the truth of all his propositions. This was instantly refused; and he was warned that, if he rejected the mercy then offered him, he should thereafter experience only justice. Declaring that, although he had never offended or disobeyed the Queen, he was yet willing to receive her mercy, he reminded them of the gross injustice that they were now manifesting; inasmuch as they themselves, twenty years before, had first led him to doubt the pretended primacy of the Bishop of Rome, and now they would not even discuss the question with him. Gardiner, to escape this home-thrust, recklessly flew to another position, and declared that he was forbidden by the Scriptures to dispute with a heretic. "I deny that I am a heretic," said Rogers quietly; "prove that first, and then allege your text." But this was also evaded, and his answer was again demanded; but he only repeated that he must first find in the Scriptures the right of the Bishop of Rome to be called supreme head.

After several appearances, Rogers and Bishop Hooper were condemned.¹ On being awaked "with much shogging" on the morning of his execution, and being told that he must die that day, he quietly said, "Then I need not

¹ An account of the trial written has printed it with great care from by Rogers himself may be found in the Lansdowne MS. Life of Rogers, Foxe, vol. VI, p. 591. Mr. Chester pp. 155 and 294.

tye my points." After being "degraded" by Bishop Bonner, assisted by his archdeacon and canons, he was the first sent to the flames, and calmly and bravely he met his fate, in the spirit of him who has the primacy of all the martyrs, and who prayed, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." Every one knows the affecting story of his meeting, on his way to the stake, his wife, who had been so cruelly denied access to him by Bishop Gardyner during his imprisonment, his eleven children being with her, the eldest a lad about seventeen years old, and the youngest a suckling on her breast. But he surmounted the trial; "the sorrowful sight of his own flesh and blood could nothing move him in the defence and quarrel of Christ's Gospel." He was burned at Smithfield on the 4th of February, 1555—thousands of thrilled spectators being attracted to the spot. Count Noailles, the French ambassador, wrote to Montmorency on the same day, "that Rogers' children so comforted him that it seemed as if he had been led to a wedding." Foxe relates that Rogers, "being then in prison, did say to the printer of this book (John Day), who was then laid up for the like cause of religion," "Thou shalt live to see the alteration, and the Gospel to be freely preached again."¹ His children had been naturalized by Parliament, the royal assent being given to the Act on the 15th of April, 1552—the Earl of Derby, and the Lords Stourton, Sands, Windsor, and Burgh having voted against the bill in the House of Lords. Many families in England and America have claimed descent from John Rogers, but without sufficient proof. Biographical sketches of several of his sons and grandsons are given in Chester's "Life of John Rogers."² One granddaughter was married to the well known Puritan commentator Jenkyn, who was minister of Christ Church, so near the familiar scene of martyrdom.

Two incidents in connection with Matthew's Bible may be noticed. The first English Concordance sprang out of the study of it. When Marbeck, one of the organists of St. George's, Windsor, was arrested and tried in 1543, he confessed to the compilation of a Concordance drawn up from a borrowed copy

¹ Vol. VI, p. 610.

² Page 259.

of Matthew's Bible, as he could not afford to buy a new one. The Bible was of such interest to him that he had begun to transcribe it for private study. When he had finished the transcription of the Pentateuch, "on fair, great paper," Master Turner called upon him unawares, and ascertaining the nature of his occupation, scorned his labour as "vain and tedious," but urged him to "set out" a Concordance. Marbeck, being wholly ignorant of the nature of such a work, asked, "What is that?" and his "friend" showed him that "it was a book to find out any word in the whole Bible by the letters." He then borrowed a Latin Concordance, and at once began to "practise his wit" upon the task, which required "not so much learning as diligence," "for thou art," said his friend, "a painful man, and cannot remain unoccupied." After a long trial before Gardyner and other bishops "sitting in commission," in 1543, he was, along with three others, condemned to the fire; but he was ultimately pardoned,¹ though Testwood, Peerson, and Filmer were burned on the meadow in front of Windsor Castle. The Concordance, dedicated to King Edward VI, was published in 1550, with the simple and significant title, "A Concordance, that is to saye, a worke wherein by the ordre of the letters A, B, C, yee may reddlye find any word conteyned in the whole Bible, so often as it is there expressed or mentioned."² By some mistake Foxe had said in his first edition that Marbeck had suffered; but in his second edition he shouts gleefully, "He liveth, God be praised, and yet to this present, and singeth merrily, and playeth on the organs." The martyr-ologist is very wroth with those who had attacked him for the error. Marbeck was admitted to the degree of Bachelor of Music at Oxford in 1549. He also supplied musical "notes" to an edition of the Book of Common Prayer published in 1550.³

In fine, it was upon this Bible of Matthew⁴ that an ingenious alteration was tried by a person whom Wanley styles, "a vil-

¹ The story is graphically told in Foxe, vol. V, p. 472.

² London, Richard Grafton.

³ Burney's History of Music, vol. II, p. 578.

⁴ Account of Lord Oxford's Bible, Lewis, History, p. 46.

lainous fellow, commonly called Captain Thornton."¹ Fuller had made the erroneous assertion that in Wycliffe's version "knave" was used for "servant." Thornton, by a clever manipulation, erased "servaunte" in Romans i, 1, and pasted over the space the word "kneawe," in letters cut out from various parts of the volume. The preliminary leaves were taken away, the date on the title-page MDXXXVII was mutilated by paring off xvii, and the Bible with a new date of MDXX was sold to the Duke of Lauderdale, who prized it very highly as a literary curiosity, for it read in Rom. i, 1, "Paul a kneawe of Jesus Christ" A Bible, affirmed to be the "identical" book, was included in the sale catalogue of the library of Mr. Offor (London, 1865); and the unsuspected forgery supplied a note to one of the Waverley fictions in explanation of the term "miller's knave." Knave does not occur in Wycliffe in the sense of servant; but the phrase knave-child, that is, male child, is used in the second version, Exodus i, 16, and Rev. xvii, 5. One MS., "ended in 1408," preserved in the Bodleian Library, and noted for many peculiar readings, has in Lev. xii, 7, "knave child." It also occurs in Chaucer's Clerk's Tale, as opposed to a "maiden child."

¹ Church History, vol. I, p. 456, ed. London, 1837.

THE GREAT BIBLE.

"Oh that I knew how all thy lights combine,
And the configurations of their glory!
Seeing not only how each verse doth shine,
But all the constellations of the story.

This verse marks that, and both do make a motion
Unto a third, that ten leaves off doth lie:
Then as dispersed herbs do watch a potion,
These three make up some Christian's destiny.

Such are thy secrets, which my life makes good,
And comments on thee: for in every thing
Thy words do find me out, and parallels bring,
And in another make me understood.

Stars are poor books, and oftentimes do miss;
This book of stars lights to eternal bliss."

HERBERT.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE Bible of Matthew or Rogers, published in 1537, which was made up of Tyndale and Coverdale, was, from the very nature of its component parts, an unequal translation. It was, however, a step in advance toward the great end, and therefore a further revision was felt to be indispensable. Coverdale's method was vague and unsatisfactory, and Matthew's edition swarmed with provoking polemical annotations. But out of it, after careful critical labour a third Bible might be evolved for national use and circulation, and which, were it approved by competent scholars, might win its way by its own merits even among the adherents of the "old learning," Coverdale himself was chosen as reviser by his old patron Crumwell; the translator now became the editor, while the basis of the work was the rival Bible of Matthew. Though Rogers himself had been in this country, he might have been thought disqualified by his pronounced opinions, and, so far as we know, he had given no decided evidence of capacity as a translator. The pliant mind of Coverdale seems to have offered no opposition to a task, which might have appeared ungracious to some minds, for no man likes to depreciate the fruits of his industry. But in the dedication of the Diglott he had said, like himself, "No less do I esteem it my duty to amend other men's faults, than if they were my own;" while in the dedication of his Bible he had avowed to the king, "I am always willing and ready to do my best as well in one translation as in another." And true to his spontaneous pledge, he did not shrink from a toil which, as it was intended to eclipse his earlier effort, also implied a confession that his volume of

1535 was deficient in many elements of an accurate popular version. He had an innate liking for Biblical studies, and he pursued them in the true spirit of "simplicity and godly sincerity." No false pride kept him from amending what he had previously done, and he did not decline a work which was meant to supersede his own Bible, of which there had been three editions, and a portion of a fourth in Thomas Matthew's.¹ His constant motive was to make Scripture intelligible, to present the record of the Divine Will clearly and impressively to the English reader, and for this purpose he availed himself of the readiest assistance. Many good people must have been stumbled by the authorized circulation of two such Bibles as those of 1535 and 1537, the second clean and sharp as steel; the first quiet and equivocal, neither decidedly one thing nor another, but both by turns. Matthew's Bible must have stirred up great opposition; but by the new revision its distinctive and anti-papal element was now taken out of it. Samson's locks were shorn, and he became "like any other man." The tastes of Cranmer were consulted more than those of the vicegerent.

Several mistakes have been made about the origin of this revision. Hume records against all proof that "a vote was passed for publishing a new translation of the Scriptures, and in three years' time the work was finished and published at Paris."² Burnet states that a motion to have a new version was made in Convocation in 1536; but he confesses, however, "to whom the work was committed, or how they proceeded in it, I know not, for the accounts of these things have not been preserved nor conveyed to us with that care that the importance of the thing required. Yet it appears that the work was carried on at a good rate, for, three years after this, it was printed at Paris."³ But the narrative is utterly proofless, and

¹ Mr. Green (History of the English People, p. 332), states that Coverdale only revised to the best of his judgment. ² History of England, vol. IV, p. 122, London, 1825. ³ History of the Reformation, vol. I, pt. ii, p. 357, Oxford, 1816.

contradicts what is definitely known of the birth of the Great Bible. Froude tells, "that Matthew's version, after being revised by the Archbishop of Canterbury, was reprinted in 1538, 1539, 1540, and 1541, under the name of the Great Bible or Cranmer's.¹ But the revision was not published in 1538, and with the edition of 1539 Cranmer had nothing to do, as we shall presently see. Some have even surmised, without any evidence, that the scraps of the revision which the Archbishop had attempted in 1534, were used in the preparation of the new Bible; and it has even been contended, as by Lord Herbert,² that the king was now requested to order a new version without tables and comments, and that he committed the matter to Crumwell, who had obtained his sanction for the two previous editions. Certainly "his good lordship" is said to be "the causer thereof," and the reviser and the superintendent of the press, writing to him from Paris, call it "your work of the Bible." Whatever, therefore, the relation of the king to the edition might be, Crumwell was the prime mover, as the correspondence so plainly shows. Paris was fixed upon as the place of printing from the superiority of paper and workmanship to be found in it. Coverdale and Grafton went over to the French capital, probably in May, and the printing was immediately commenced at the press of Regnault. A royal license had been obtained from Francis, at the request of Henry, *noster carissimus frater*, but it contained stipulations which might at any time lead to the suspension of the enterprise; for the ecclesiastical authorities, though forced for a time to wink at it, were jealous of it from the beginning.³ In an early communication to Crumwell, Coverdale and Grafton inform him, that they have sent him two copies on parchment—the only two to be so printed—one

¹ History of England, vol. IV, p. 291, fourth edition, 1867.

² England under Henry VIII, p. 614, London, 1870. Dibdin also (Bibliomania, p. 328) carelessly talks of it as being made "under the archiepiscopal patronage of Cranmer."

³ The license was to last as long as they did not print "*privatas ullas aut illegitimas opiniones*." Strype's Life of Cranmer, vol. I, p. 439, Oxford, 1848. A copy of the license is given in his Appendix xxx.

for the king, and one for himself, and that they enclosed a third specimen, printed on the paper on which it was to be published. They also unfold their plan: "We follow not only a standing text of the Hebrew with the interpretation of the Chaldee and the Greek; but we set also in a private (separate) table the diversity of readings of all texts, with such annotations in another table, as shall doubtless delucidate and clear the same; as well without any singularity of opinions, as all checkings and reproofs. The print, no doubt, shall please your good lordship: the paper is of the best sort in France. The charge is certainly great; wherein as we most humbly require your favourable help at this present, with whatsoever it shall please your lordship to let us have. . . . We be daily threatened and look ever to be spoken to withal."¹ As the work proceeded, the method was more fully explained, and on the 9th of August they write to the Lord Privy Seal: "Your work going forward, we thought it our most bounden duty to send unto your lordship certain leaves thereof, specially seeing we had so good occasion, by the returning of your beloved servant Sebastian;² and as they are done, so will we send your lordship the residue, from time to time."³

"As touching the manner and order that we keep in the same work, pleaseth it your good lordship to be advertised, that the mark  in the text signifieth that upon the same (in the latter end of the book) there is some notable annotations, which we have written without any private opinion, only after the best interpreters of the Hebrews, for the more clearness of the text.⁴ This mark  betokeneth that upon the same text there is diversity of reading, among the Hebrews, Chaldees, and Greeks, and Latinists, as in a table at the end

¹ Grafton signs himself, Richard Grafton, grocer.

² Sebastian is sometimes said to be Crumwell's cook. State Papers, Crumwell's Correspondence, vol. I, No. 167.

³ Ibid., p. 108.

⁴ During the last three years

Coverdale may have obtained some knowledge of Hebrew; but he could learn all that he says from the "interpreters" usually consulted by him. The variations referred to might be easily found in the Complutensian Polyglott,

of the book shall be declared. This mark  showeth that the sentence, written in small letters, is not in the Hebrew or Chaldee, but in the Latin, and seldom in the Greek, and that we, nevertheless, would not have it extinct, but highly accept it, for the more explanation of the text. This token † in the Old Testament giveth to understand that the same text that followeth it is also alleged of Christ, or of some Apostle in the New Testament. This, among other our necessary labours, is the way that we take in this work; trusting verily that as Almighty God moved your lordship to set us unto it, so shall it be to His glory, and right welcome to all them that love to serve Him, and their Prince, in true faithful obedience." On the 12th September they wrote again, telling that they had been instantly desired by their host to ask a license for him, who had been "an occupier" more than forty years, to sell in England books printed by him on the Continent, the importation having been prohibited by the Company of Booksellers, and as an inducement to grant the privilege they pleaded for, they subjoin, "We shall fare none the worse in the readiness and due expedition of this your lordships Bible, which is going well forward, and within four months will draw to an end by the grace of Almighty God." Coverdale had already asked a monopoly for James Nycolson, who published the second and third editions of his New Testament, and now in his kind-heartedness he asked a relaxation of patent on behalf of Regnault.

Bonner,¹ the English ambassador, and successor to Gardyner at Paris, had been very kind and patronizing to the English party, had them often at dinner, and often dined with them at the printer's house, when he generously defrayed the expense. He had taken a liking to Coverdale's Diglott Testament, and the license from the French king gave liberty to print

¹ Bishop elect of Hereford, formerly Archdeacon of Leicester, and afterwards Bishop of London, a reformer apparently up to the time of his elevation to the episcopal bench. He had been favoured by Crumwell, and did not appear in his true character till after his patron's execution. Bonner is said to have written the Homily on Charity.

Bibles in Latin and English—*Latine quam Britannice*. On the 13th of December, Coverdale asked to know Crumwell's pleasure about the annotations, and whether the places noted by the "hands" should pass undeclared, "promising to avoid any private opinion or contentious words," and offering all notes to be inspected by Bonner before they were printed. He also intimates that he sends home, through Bonner, another portion of the printed sheets, that these at least may be "safe," should the ecclesiastics of Paris "confiscate" what they could lay their hands on. His precaution was wise, and, indeed, a first warning put Coverdale and Grafton on their guard. Before the printing was finished, and four days after this last letter, an Inhibition was launched against them. The inquisitor-general had been influenced to interfere, and on the 17th December, 1538, he issued through Le Tellier, the "sworn scribe" of the Holy Office, an edict¹ forbidding the work, seized the pages already printed and not conveyed across the Channel, and cited the printer to appear before his tribunal. The Englishmen fled for safety, but left behind them many sheets, which were condemned to be "burned in the Place Maubert," close upon the Rue des Anglais.² But an officer of the Inquisition, for the sake of a little money, sold them as waste paper to a haberdasher "to lay caps in," and "four great dry vats" full of them were purchased and saved. Presses, types, and workmen were also in a short time brought over to England, and in two or three months the printing was completed—in April, 1539. This volume, begun in Paris, and finished in London, is the "GREAT BIBLE," the name being given it on account of its size.³

¹ The original is in the British Museum, Cotton MSS., Cleop. E. V., fol. 326.

² Foxe suggestively adds, "a spot like Smithfield."

³ When Mr. Blunt, in his condemnation of Tyndale as a decided Protestant, virtually ranks his New Testament among those taken

from secondary sources, and sneers at him for "thrusting himself forward as a translator, and hindering the progress of an authorized version," it is enough to reply that of the first authorized version of 1539, two-thirds were the immediate and personal work of Tyndale.

This first edition of the Great Bible, sometimes erroneously termed Cranmer's, is a handsome folio, printed in black letter, with the title—

"The Byble in Englyshe, that is to saye, the content of all the holy scripture, bothe of the olde & newe testament, trully translated after the veryte of the Hebrue and Greke textes, by the dylygent studye of dyuerse excellent learned men, expert in the forsayde tonges. Prynted by Rychard Grafton & Edward Whitchurch. Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum. 1539." The colophon carries, "The Ende of the New Testament & of the whole Byble, Fynisshed in Apryll, Anno MCCCCXXXIX. A Domino factum est istud."

There is no proof that these "dyverse excellent learned men" were living divines working with Coverdale, and there is no trace of any such co-operation in his correspondence. But the versions so referred to are easily recognized, for the Bible was made by the continuous consultation of Münster and Erasinus. The Latin motto quoted from Psalm cxviii, 23, is a grateful recognition of the kind and watchful guardianship of the Divine Author of Scripture. Grafton, who had charge of the printing, has this high witness borne to him in a recommendatory epistle prefixed to his Chronicle by Thomas N. . . . "The Bible in English, that vnvaluable Jewell, we haue by his trauayle, first with his charge and attendaunce procuring the translation thereof, then sundrie times copying the same out with his own hande, thirdly printing it in Fraunce with his great expense and perill. . . . Not discouraged herewith, but still caried with zeale to doe good, he attempted the woorke againe, and to Gods great praise and to the edification of Christes Church, performed it." Grafton was of good family and appears at one time to have had a seat in Parliament; but he became so poor in his old age, that he applied to be taken on as a government informer.

The Bible has an elaborately artistical frontispiece, designed by Holbein. At the top is the Saviour in the clouds, with two Latin scrolls issuing from His lips, the one thrown out towards the right hand being, *Verbum meum quod egredietur de ore meo non revertetur ad me vacuum, sed faciet*

quaecunque volui, Esa. lv;¹ and that towards the left being, Inveni virum juxta cor meum, qui faciet omnes voluntates meas.² Below the figure in the clouds is the king on his throne, with his crown and insignia of the Garter at his feet, and holding in each hand a book entitled, Verbum Dei. On the right of the throne stand Cranmer and some ecclesiastics, with their mitres on the ground; and as the king presents the book to Cranmer, the scroll addressed to him, as representing the group, is, Hæc praecepe et doce.³ Upon the king's left stands Crumwell with other peers. The king gives the book to him as their leader, and the thick and heavy scroll intended for them reads, A me constitutum est decretum, ut in universo imperio et regno meo homines tremiscant et paveant Deum viventem.⁴ There is another scroll lying over the royal breast, also addressed to them, inscribed with the words, Quod justum est, judicate.⁵—Ita parvum audietis ut magnum.⁶ One of the group, kneeling, has the legend issuing from his mouth, Verbum tuum lucerna pedibus meis.⁷ Lower down on the one side of the title which occupies the centre, Crumwell is depicted again with the Verbum Dei in his hand which he is giving to those around him, with the scroll over his head, Diserte a malo et fac bonum, inquire pacem et persequere eam.⁸ Psalm xxxiii. On the other side of the title, Cranmer, arrayed in pontificals, with his coat-of-arms at his feet, is giving the Verbum Dei to the eager clergy, with the issuing scroll, Pascite, qui in vobis est, gregem Christi, prima Pe. v.⁹ The last compartment, under the title, fills the whole breadth of the page,

¹ So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please. Isaiah lv, 18.

² I have found a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfil all my will. Acts xiii, 22.

³ These things command and teach. 1 Tim. iv 11.

⁴ I make a decree, That in every dominion of my kingdom men trem-

ble and fear before the living God. Daniel vi, 26.

⁵ Judge righteously. Deut. i, 16.

⁶ Ye shall hear the small as well as the great. Deut. i, 17.

⁷ Thy word is a lamp unto my feet. Psalm cxix, 105.

⁸ Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it. Psalm xxxiv, 14.

⁹ Feed the flock of God which is among you. 1 Peter v, 2.

like the first compartment above it. In one corner a preacher is addressing a crowd, and the scroll contains his text, Obsecro igitur primum omnium fieri obsecrationes, orationes, postulationes, gratiarum actiones, pro omnibus hominibus, pro regibus,¹ &c., 1 Timo. ii; and the congregation are shouting in reply, some Vivat Rex, and some, including females, God save the Kynge. At the lower portion of the left-hand corner are children, who are not supposed to know Latin, and who are also shouting God save the Kynge. Three prisoners, looking out on the scene from grated windows, appear to be filled with chagrin and amazement, while the people in front, notably a figure girt with a sword, are flaunting toward them many a Vivat Rex, in scorn of their disloyalty.

The numerous notes in Matthew's Bible, and its prefatory theological miscellany, were set aside; and Bale ascribes such removal of the annotation table and prefaces to popish influence. The Great Bible has no notes, not even a dedication. Coverdale's own proposed annotations were omitted; and the volume, in the eyes of its editor, must have appeared naked, while the ingenious apparatus of signals pointed specially to that nakedness. So that the short preface makes explanation and apology: "We have also (as ye may see) added many hands, both in the margin of this volume and also in the text, upon the which we purposed to have made, in the end of the Bible (in a table by themselves), certain godly annotations, but, forasmuch as yet there hath not been sufficient time ministered to the king's most honourable council for the oversight and correction of the said annotations, we will therefore omit them till their more convenient leisure, doing now no more but beseech thee, most gentle reader, that when thou comest at such a place where a hand doth stand, . . . and thou canst not attain to the meaning and true knowledge of that sentence, then do not rashly presume to make any private interpretation thereof, but submit thyself to the judgment of those that are godly learned in Christ Jesus." The "more

¹ I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, &c. 1 Timothy ii, 1, 2.

convenient" leisure never came, though several editions retained the "hands" and other signs.

Coverdale's language in the previous sentences betrays his constitutional weakness, his want of firmness and decision. He sacrificed somewhat to expediency, and wished to be "all things to men" in a way more flaccid than he who first used the phrase ever intended or exemplified. But his pliancy arose not from any regard to worldly interest or honour; it sprang from a desire to charm others over to his opinions. He would not be unfaithful; but he could give his fidelity, if it were to cause offence, the gentleness of the dove. He was too apt to forget that the "soft answer" may not be the most effective answer, though it turn away wrath. It was undutiful to himself and to his convictions to profess such eagerness to tune his annotations so as to suit the temper and likings of those who might inspect and criticize them.

The Great Bible owed its existence to Crumwell and to his Protestant zeal. He had determined that there should be such a book, and he was not a man to be lightly turned from his purpose, for the prominent elements of his character were decision and energy. The merit then belongs really to the vicegerent, and neither to the king nor the archbishop. The copy designed for himself—printed on vellum, with gilt leaves, the covers embossed with brass, and the frontispiece having his arms in colours—is now in the library of St. John's College, Cambridge. Crumwell had also been preparing measures for its immediate and extensive circulation. The archbishop had laid injunctions on the diocese of Hereford that its clergy "shall have by the first day of August next coming (1539?), as well a whole Bible in Latin and English, or at least a New Testament of both the same languages, as the copies of the king's highness' injunctions." This document, drawn up some time in 1538, pointed to the forthcoming volume of the next year. The vicar-general had issued injunctions also as early as September, when the interruption could not have been foreseen: "Item, that ye shall provide on this side the feast of ——— next comyng, one boke of the whole Bible in the largest volume in Englyshe, and the same sett up in summe

convenyent place within the said church that ye have cure of, whereat your parishners may most commodiously resort to the same and rede yt; the charges of whiche boke shal be vatable born between the parson and the parishners aforesaid, that is to say, the one half by youe, and th' other half by them." Latimer issued similar injunctions to the diocese of Worcester. "The Bible of largest volume in English" specified in this Injunction is, without doubt, the Great Bible. In size none of the others can compete with it, neither Coverdale's nor Matthew's. Its pages are fully fifteen inches in length, and over nine in breadth. There was also a royal proclamation repeating and enforcing many portions of a previous edict.¹

And so the work was done. The order had gone forth for the free circulation of Scripture, and was not for some time to be recalled. Private enterprise had translated and multiplied the English Bible, in spite of keen and malignant opposition. The king gave no grant in assistance, nor was any sum voted from the exchequer. Bishop Gardyner had no influence at the moment to prevent it; but the clergy did "malign the printing of this Bible."

The Great Bible of 1539 is the text of Matthew revised; or is, in other words, Coverdale's revision both of his own and Tyndale's translation. In the revision of the New Testament Coverdale had the assistance of the Latin version of Erasmus, and in many cases was influenced by it. Thus, from the Epistle to the Galatians, chap. iii, the following specimens may be taken:—

VERSE	TYNDALE.	GREAT BIBLE, 1539. ²
3	Ye would now end.	ye now end.
4	if that be vain.	if it be also in vain.
5	Which ministered to you.	Moreover he that ministereth.
7	Understand therefore that.	Ye know therefore.
8	the scripture saw aforehand.	the scripture seeing aforehand.
9	and therefore.	—
10	under malediction.	subject to the curse.

¹ Burnet, p. 337,

² 3, consummamini; 4, si et frustra; 5, qui igitur; 7, scitis igitur; 8, prævidens; 9, omitted in Erasmus and in the Great Bible; 10, execrationi obnoxii.

Verse	TYNDALE.	GREAT BIBLE, 1539. ¹
13	was made accursed.	inasmuch as he was made accursed.
14	and that we might receive.	that we might receive.
15	I will speak. when it is once allowed.	I speak. if it be allowed.
16	as in one.	as of one.
18	cometh not.	cometh not now.
21	howbeit if there had been a law. should have come.	for if there had been given. should come.
23	Before that faith came. kept & shut up under the law.	but before that. kept under the law & were shut up.
24	unto the time of Christ.	unto Christ.
25	sons of God by the faith.	children of God because ye believe.
28	now is there no. but ye are all one thing.	there is no. for ye are all one.
29	by promise.	according to the promise.

Münster especially, and Pagninus served the same purpose for the Old Testament that Erasmus did for the New. Over twenty years after this period, Bishop Sandys said with perfect truth, "The setters forth of this our common translation [the Great Bible] followed Münster too much, who doubtless was a very negligent man in his doings, and often swerved very much from the Hebrew." Bishop Sandys is right as to the fact that Münster was constantly used; but his disparagement of the Latin version of Münster is baseless, for it is very literal, and on the whole accurate, though the Latin idiom is occasionally sacrificed.² The following collation of the second Psalm

¹ 13, dum factus est; 14, and omitted in the Great Bible and Erasmus; 15, dico; si sit comprobatum; 16, de uno; 18, non jam; 21, etenim si data; esset; 23, cæterum; sub lege custodiebamur, conclusi—Vulgate also; 24, ad Christum; 25, eo quod credidistis; 28, non est; 29, omnes enim vos unus estis; 29, juxta promissionem. Erasmus.
² Sebastian Münster, born in 1489, studied under Stapfer and Reuchlin at Tübingen; was Professor of Hebrew, first at Heidelberg, and then at Basle. Died there of the plague in 1552. Besides many works bearing on Hebrew philology, he published a Latin version of the Old Testament with notes from Rabbinical commentaries, two vols., folio, Basil, 1534-35, reprinted in 1546. The translation is literal and perspicuous. Father Simon and Geddes prefer it, though it be the work of a Protestant, to the version of Pagninus.

and the twenty-third Psalm may suffice as an illustration:—

Verse	COVERDALE.	GREAT BIBLE, 1539.
1	Why do the Heithen grudge? why do the people ymagyne wayne thinges?	Why do the heathen so <i>furiously</i> rage ¹ together; & why do the people imagine a <i>vain thing</i> . ²
2	The kynges of the earthe stode vp, & the rulers are come together, agaynst the Lorde, & agaynst his anoynted.	The kings of the earth stand up, & the rulers <i>take counsel together</i> . ³ against the Lord & against his Anointed.
3	Let vs breake their bondes a sunder, & cast a waye their <i>yocke</i> ⁴ from vs.	Let us break their bonds asunder; & cast away their <i>cords</i> ⁵ from us.
4	<i>Neverthelcsse</i> , ⁶ he that dwelleth in heauen, shall laugh them to scorne; <i>yee euen</i> ⁷ the Lord himself shall have them in derision.	⁸ He that dwelleth in heaven shall laugh them to scorn: ⁹ the Lord shall have them in derision.
5	Then shal he speake vnto them in his wrathe, and vex them in his sore displeasure. ¹⁰	Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath; and vex them in his sore displeasure.
6	Yet haue I set my kynge vpon my holy hill of Sion. ¹¹	Yet have I set my king: upon my holy hill of Sion.
7	<i>As for me</i> , ¹² I will <i>preache</i> ¹³ the lawe; wherof the Lorde hath sayde vnto me: Thou art my sonne, this daye haue I begotten the.	I will preach the law, whereof the Lord hath said unto me: Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.

¹ Ad tumultum conveniunt, Münster.

² Rem inanem, Münster

³ Simul ineunt consilium, Münster; consiliabuntur pariter, Pagninus.

⁴ Jugum, Vulgate.

⁵ Funes eorum, Münster and Pagninus.

⁶ "Nevertheless" represents the "Aber" of Luther and the Zürich Bible.

⁷ "Yee even" may represent the repeated "der" of the Zürich version.

⁸ No word representing "Nevertheless" is found in Münster or Pagninus.

⁹ No word representing "Yee even" is found in the Hebrew or the Latin versions.

¹⁰ Coverdale follows the Vulgate in preference to the Zürich.

¹¹ Coverdale follows Luther and the Zürich in preference to the Latin version.

¹² "As for me," probably suggested by the "bey mir selbs" of the Zürich Bible.

¹³ Predigen, Luther.

COVERDALE.

GREAT BIBLE, 1539.

Verse.

- 8 *Desyre off me*,¹ & I shall geue the the
Heithen for thine enheritaunce,
Yee the vttermost partes of the
worlde for thy possession.
- 9 Thou shalt *rule*³ them with a rodde
of yron, & breake them in peces
like an erthen vessell.
- 10 Be wyse now therfore (o ye kynges)
be warned,⁷ ye that are judges of
the earth.
- 11 Serve the Lorde *with*⁹ feare, &
reioyce before him with reuer-
ence.
- 12 Kysse the sonne, lest *the Lorde*¹³ be
angrie, & so ye perish from the
*right*¹³ waye. *For*¹⁴ *his wrath*
shalbe kindled *shortly*¹⁵; blessed
are all they that put their trust
in him.

Desire of me, & I shall give thee
the heathen for thine inheri-
tance: & the utmost parts of the
*earth*² for thy possession.

Thou shalt *bruise*⁴ them with a rod
of iron; & *break them*⁵ in pieces
like a *potter's vessel*.⁶

Be wise now therefore, O ye kings!
*be learned*⁸ ye that are judges of
the earth.

Serve the Lord *in fear*:¹⁰ & reioice
*unto him*¹¹ with reverence.

Kiss the son lest *he*¹⁶ be angry, and
so ye perish from the right
way: *if his wrath* be kindled¹⁷
(*yea, but a little*),¹⁸ blessed are
all they that put their trust in
him.

The words "unto him" in verse 11, and "right" in verse 12, are printed
in small type in the edition of 1540.

PSALM XXIII.

- 1 The Lorde is my shepherde,¹⁹ I can
want nothinge.
- The Lorde is my shepherde, *there-*
*fore*²⁰ can I lack nothing.

¹ Zürich Bible.² Terræ, Münster.³ Reges, Vulgate; regieren, Zürich
Bible.⁴ Conteres, Pagninus.⁵ Confringes, Pagninus—the two
verbs being reversed in Münster.⁶ Vas figuli, Vulgate and Latin
versions.⁷ Suggested by Luther and the
Zürich Bible.⁸ Erudiamini, Münster.⁹ Luther and the Zürich Bible.¹⁰ In timore, Vulgate and Münster.¹¹ Vulgate and Sept.¹² Vulgate and Sept.¹³ Vulgate and Sept.¹⁴ Denn, Luther.¹⁵ In brevi, Vulgate; bald, Luther.¹⁶ "The Lord" omitted in Münster.¹⁷ Ne irascatur, Münster.¹⁸ Vel paululum, Münster.¹⁹ Coverdale has not translated the
"darumb" of the Zürich Bible, but
follows the Vulgate and Luther.²⁰ Ideo, Münster.

COVERDALE.

GREAT BIBLE, 1539.

Verse

- 2 He *fedeth*¹ me in a greene pasture; &
ledeth me to a *fresh water*.²
- 3 He *quickeneth my soule*,⁷ and bring-
eth me forth in the waye of
rightousnes for his names
sake.
- 4 Though I shulde walke *now*¹⁰ *in*¹¹ the
valley of the shadowe of death,
*yet*¹² I feare no euell, for thou art
with me; thy staffe & thy shepe-
hoke *comforte*¹³ me
- 5 Thou preparest a table before me
agaynst mine enemies; ¹⁷ thou
anoyntest my heade with oyle,
& *fyllest my cuppe*¹⁸ full.
- 6 Oh let thy louying kyndnes & mercy
folowe me all the dayes off my
life *that I maye dwell*²³ in the
house off the Lorde for euer.
- He *shall*³ fede me in a grene pas-
ture, & leade me *forthe*⁴ *besyde*⁵
the *waters of comforte*.⁶
- He *shall conuerte*⁸ my soule, &
bryng me forth in the *pathes*⁹ of
ryghteousnes for hys names
sake.
- Yee¹⁴ though I walke *thorow*¹⁵ ye
valley of the shadow of death,
I will fear *no euell*,¹⁶ for thou art
with me, thy rodde & thy staffe
comforte me.
- Thou shalt *prepare*¹⁹ a table before
me *agaynst them that trouble*
me,²⁰ thou hast²¹ anoynted my
head with oyle, & my *cuppe*
shalbe full.²²
- But²⁴ (thy) louynge kyndnes & mercy
*shall*²⁵ folowe me all the dayes
of my lyfe, *I will dwell*²⁶ in the
house of the Lord for ever.

¹ Er weidet mich, Luther and the
Zürich.² After Luther, the Zürich having
"still waters." The phrase adopted
by the Genevan came through it into
the Authorized Version.³ Accubare faciet, "shall make me
to lie down," Münster.⁴ Deducet.⁵ Juxta, Münster.⁶ Aquas refrigerii, do.⁷ Erquicket, Zürich and Luther.⁸ Convertet, Pagninus.⁹ In semitis, Münster.¹⁰ Schon, Luther and the Zürich.¹¹ In Vulgate and Zürich.¹² Doch, Zürich.¹³ Future form in Hebrew.

VOL. I.

¹⁴ Etiam, Pagninus and Münster.¹⁵ Per, Pagninus and Münster.¹⁶ Malum, Pagninus and Münster.¹⁷ Contra, Pagninus.¹⁸ Fullest, Zürich.¹⁹ Præparabis, Münster and Pag-
ninus.²⁰ Adversus eos, Münster.²¹ Münster and Pagninus.²² Satus, do. do.²³ Vulgate and Zürich.²⁴ Veruntamen, Münster and
Pagninus.²⁵ Sequentur, do. do.²⁶ Morabor, do. do."And I will dwell" being in the
edition of 1540.

So careful had been Coverdale's revision, and so little attachment had he to his previous version, that in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, the Bible of 1539 differs in nearly forty places from his earlier one of 1535.

The enemies of a free English Bible were spiteful in their attempts to frustrate the proclamation, quoted on a previous page. Many "parsons, vicars, and curates, read confusedly the Word of God; and the injunctions set forth and commanded by them to be read; humming, and hawing, and hawking thereat, that scarce any could understand them." "When your royal highness gave commandment that the bishops should see that there were in every church one Bible at least, set at liberty, so that every man might freely come to it, and read therein, many of this wicked generation, as well priests as others their faithful adherents, would pluck it, either into the quire, or else into some pew, where poor men durst not presume to come; yea, there is no small number of churches that hath no Bible at all."¹ . . . "They bade their parishioners notwithstanding what they read, being compelled so to do, that they should do as they did in times past as their fathers; and that the old fashion is the best: and other crafty and seditious sayings they gave among them."

The Bible of 1539 was, however, warmly welcomed by the people, and the words of Strype, taken from a manuscript of Foxe, more probably apply to it than to the earlier edition of Matthew:² "It was wonderful to see with what joy this book of God was received not only among the learned sort, and those that were noted for lovers of the reformation; but generally all England over, among all the vulgar and common people; and with what greediness God's Word was read, and what resort to places where the reading of it was. Everybody that could bought the book, or busily read it, or got others to read it to them if they could not themselves, and divers more elderly people learned to read on purpose, and even little boys flocked among the rest to hear portions of the Holy Scripture read."

¹ Strype's *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, vol. I, pt i, p. 612; *Life of Coverdale*, p. 199.

² *Life of Cranmer*, vol. I, p. 141.

This statement is corroborated by a document found in the State Paper Office, and printed by Collier: "Englishmen have now in hand in every church, and place, and almost every man, the Holy Bible and New Testament in their mother tongue, instead of the old fabulous and fantastical books of the Table Round, Lancelot du Lake, Huou de Bourdeux, Bevis of Hampton, Guy of Warwick, &c., and such other, whose impure filth and vain fabulosity the light of God has abolished utterly."¹

¹ *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. IX, p. 162, London, 1852.

CHAPTER XXVII.

DURING the autumn of this year (1539), preparations were made for the printing of a new edition at home, Parisian types and workmen being still kept in London. Cranmer was naturally busy about the work, for he felt that it needed some special superintendence. His own mind was opening more fully to the light, and amidst the perplexing secular intricacies and anxieties attaching to his office, and the political combinations which he had daily to deal with in that period of change, he resolved on securing for the Bible an unimpeded circulation. To the volume in progress, which often goes under his name, he composed a preface which, through Crumwell, was to be submitted to the king. On this matter he writes to the vicegerent, on the 14th of November, 1539, a sensible and practical letter, asking whether the preface¹ to the Bible had got the royal approval, and discussing the price of the prepared volume. The archbishop settled it at 13s. 4d., which Crumwell had thought rather high, and the publisher naturally rather low. But Berthelet and Whitchurch were willing to fix it at 10s. on condition that they alone were to print and publish it. It is certainly a very strange coincidence that, on the 14th November, 1539—the date of Cranmer's letter—Crumwell got from

¹ Mr. Hunt (*Religious Thought in England*, vol. I, p. 33), gives this hypothetic proof or illustration of Cranmer's moderate Calvinism, "If we are to take the notes on the Great Bible, known as Cranmer's Bible, to be his, which certainly we ought to do." But the Great Bible is specially marked by the total absence of all notes, the pointing hands indicating a purpose unfilled.

the king a patent, conferring on him the sole and unlimited power of licensing the printing and publication of English Bibles for the next five years. The early and curious patent, so distinct and precise in its terms, runs to the following effect—

"Henry the Eighth, &c. To all and singular prynters and sellers of bookes within this our realme, and to all other officers, mynisters, and subjectes, these our Letters hearyng or seeyng, Greeting—

"We let you witt, that beyng desirous to have our people at tymes convenyent geve themselves to th' atteynyng of the knowlege of Goddes Worde, whereby they shall the better honour hym, and observe and kepe his commaundements, and also do their duties the better to us beyng their prince and soveraign lord; and considering that as this oure zeale and desire cannot by any meane take so good effecte, as by the graunting to theym the free and lyberall use of the Bible in oure oune maternall English tongue; so onles it be forseen, that the same passe at the beginnyng by one Translation to be perused and considerid, the frailte of menne is suche, that the diversitie thereof maye brede and brnyge forthe manyfolde inconvenyences, as when wilfull and hedy folks shall conferre upon the diversitie of the said Translations: We have therefore appoynted oure right trusty and welbeloved counsellour the lorde Crumwell, keeper of our pryvye seale, to take for us, and in oure name, special care and charge, that no manner of persone or persones within this our realme shall enterprise, attempt, or sett in hand, to print any Bible in the English tonge of any maner of volume, duryng the space of fyve yeres next ensuyng after the date hereof, but only suche as shall be deputid, assignid, and admitted, by the said lord Crumwell. Willing and commanding all maires, shirefes, bailiffes, constables, and all other oure officers, ministres, and subjectes, to be ayding to our said counsailour in the execution of this oure pleasure, and to be conformable in the accomplishment of the same, as shall apperteigne."¹

¹ Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. III, p. 846. Burnet, *Records*, vol. I, pt. ii, p. 283.

This proclamation, which in these days had the force of law, ends with the peremptory *per ipsum regem*;¹ is quite autocratic, and wholly ignores Council, Convocation, and Parliament. It bases itself on the king's sole and sovereign will, and interposes the full royal authority against all resistance. There were probably some existing circumstances which suggested the royal incisiveness. The Bible about which Cranmer corresponded with the Privy Seal, was still delayed in publication, and one reason given by Fulke is, that Henry consulted the bishops, and that these mitred critics did not commit themselves by a hasty response. The preface was ready by November; but the volume was not published till the April of the following year. The story, which most probably refers to this Bible, is told by Fulke. "I myself, and so did many hundreds beside me, heard that reverend father, M. Doctor Coverdale, of holy and reverend memory, in a sermon at Paul's Cross, upon occasion of some slanderous reports that then were raised against his translation, declare his faithful purpose in doing the same; which after it was finished, and presented to the king, Henry VIII, of famous memory, and by him committed to divers bishops of that time to peruse, of which (as I remember) Stephen Gardiner was one; after they had kept it long in their hands, and the king was diverse times sued unto for the publication thereof, at the last, being called for by the king himself, they redelivered the book, and being demanded by the king what was their judgment of the translation, they answered that there was many faults therein. 'Well,' said the king, 'but are there any heresies maintained thereby?' They answered, there were no heresies they could find maintained thereby. 'If there be no heresies,' said the king, 'then, in God's name, let it go abroad among our people.'² According to this judgment of the king and the bishops, M. Coverdale defended his translation, confessing that he did now himself espy some faults, which, if he might review it once over again, as he had done twice before, he doubted not but to amend;

¹ Rymer's *Fœdera*, vol. XIV, p. 649. ² Defence of Translations of the Bible, p. 98, Parker Society ed.

but for any heresy, he was sure there was none maintained by his translation." Coverdale's statement about reviewing his version "twice before" describes the work which he had done on the Bibles of 1539 and 1540. The reference cannot be to the Diglott; and it can scarcely be to the two editions "overseen and corrected," of his own first translation which were published in 1537, for the changes in these are so very few and slight, that the process could not with any propriety be called "reviewing."

But though the Bibles of 1539 and 1540 were not wholly of his first translation, as they included a large portion of Tynedale's work, they were the result of a genuine revision carried out by him, but not with uniform closeness through all the books of Scripture. Coverdale was certainly the editor of the second Great Bible, as well as of the first one. Fulke in his "Defence of English Translations" from the attack of Gregory Martin, thus replies to his opponent's loose reference to various editions,—"I guess that the Bible of 1562 is that which was of Dr. Coverdale's translation,"¹ and in another place, he calls it, "Master Coverdale's Bible of 1562."² Now, the Bible of 1562 was a reprint of the Great Bible of 1540. Gregory Martin singles out the Great Bible in one passage as "the Bible authorized by the Archbishop, and read all king Edward's time in their churches and (as it seemeth by the late printing again, anno 1562) a great part of this queen's reign."³

Cranmer's prologue is judicious in its choice of topics, and quiet but earnest in spirit and language. Thus it opens: "Concerning two sundry sorts of people, it seemeth necessary that something be said in the entry of this book, by way of a preface or prologue; whereby hereafter it may be both the the better accepted of them which hitherto could not well bear it, and also the better used of them which heretofore have misused it. For truly some there are that be too slow, and need the spur; some other seem too quick, and need more of the bridle. Some lose their game by short shooting; some by

¹ Defence of Translations of the Bible, p. 68, Parker Society ed. ³ Discovery of the Manifold Corruptions, &c., p. 11, Rheims, John Fogny, 1582.
² Do., p. 548.

overshooting. Some walk too much on the left hand; some too much on the right. In the former sort by all they that refuse to read, or to hear read, the Scripture in the vulgar tongue; much worse they that let also, or discourage, the other from the reading or hearing thereof. In the latter sort be they which, by their inordinate reading, indiscrete speaking, contentious disputing, or otherwise by their licentious living, slander and hinder the Word of God most of all other, whereof they would seem to be greatest furtherers. These two sorts, albeit they be most far unlike the one to the other, yet they both deserve in effect like reproach. Neither can I well tell, whether of them I may judge the more offender, him that doth obstinately refuse so godly and goodly knowledge, or him that so ungodly and so ungodly abuseth the same." Then follows a vindication of English translations according to ancient custom, succeeded by a long extract from Chrysostom on the duty and benefit of reading the Holy Scriptures, with a pithy application from Cranmer himself: "Therefore, in few words, to comprehend the largeness and utility of the Scripture, how it containeth fruitful instruction and erudition for every man, if anything be necessary to be learned, of the Holy Scripture we may learn it. If falsehood shall be reprov'd, thereof we may gather wherewithal. If anything to be corrected and amended; if there need any exhortation or consolation, of the Scripture we may well learn. In the Scriptures be the fat pastures of the soul; therein is no venomous meat, no unwholesome thing: they be the very dainty and pure feeding. He that is ignorant shall find there what he should learn. He that is a perverse sinner shall there find his damnation to make him to tremble for fear. He that laboureth to serve God shall there find his glory, and the promissions of eternal life, exhorting him more diligently to labour. Herein may princes learn how to govern their subjects; subjects obedience, love, and dread to their princes; husbands, how they should behave unto their wives, how to educate their children and servants; and contrary, wives, children, and servants may know their duty to their husbands, parents, and masters.

Here may all manner of persons, men, women, young, old, learned, unlearned, sick, poor, priests, laymen, lords, ladies, officers, tenants, and mean men; virgins, wives, widows, lawyers, merchants, artificers, husbandmen, and all manner of persons, of what estate or condition soever they be; may in this book learn all things what they ought to believe, what they ought to do, and what they should not do, as well concerning Almighty God, as also concerning themselves and all other. Briefly, to the reading of the Scripture none can be enemy, but that either be too so sick, that they love not to hear of any medicine; or else that be so ignorant that they know not Scripture to be the most healthful medicine. Therefore, as touching this former part, I will here conclude and take it for conclusion, sufficiently determined and appointed, that it is convenient and good for the Scriptures to be read of all sorts and kinds of people, and in the vulgar tongue, without further allegations and probations for same. Wherefore, I would advise you all, that come to the reading or hearing of This Book, which is the Word of God, the most precious jewel, and most holy relic that remaineth upon earth, that ye bring with you the fear of God, and that ye do it with all reverence, and use your knowledge thereof not to vain glory of frivolous disputation; but to the honour of God, increase of virtue, and edification both of yourselves and others." Next there is a long and appropriate quotation from St. Gregory Nazianzen, on those who did not considerably read and study the Word of God—"idle babblers and talkers"; the conclusion being, "This is the mind and almost the words of Gregory Nazianzen, doctor of the Greek Church, of whom St. Jerome said, that unto his time the Latin Church had no writer able to be compared, and to make an even match with him. Therefore, to conclude the latter part, every man that cometh to the reading of This Holy Book ought to bring with him first and foremost this fear of Almighty God; and then, next, a firm and stable purpose to reform his own self according thereunto; and so to continue, proceed, and prosper, from time to time; showing himself to be a sober and fruitful hearer and learner. Which if he do, he

shall prove at length well able to teach, though not with his mouth, yet with his living and good example; which is sure the most lively and effectuous form and manner of teaching. He that otherwise intermeddleth with This Book, let him be assured that once he shall make account therefore, when he shall have said to him, as it is written in the prophet David, "Peccatori dicit Deus, &c."

The volume, with Cranmer's prologue, was at length published in April, 1540, with the following title in black and red:

"The Byble in Englyshe, that is to saye the content of al the holy scripture, both of the olde, and newe testament, with a prologe therinto, made by the reverende father in God, Thomas archbysshop of Cantorbury, This is the Byble apoynted to the use of the churches. Prynted by Rychard Grafton. *Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum*, M.D.XL." The colophon is "The ende of the newe Testament; and of the whole Byble, fynished in Apryll, anno M.CCCC.XL. *A Domino factum est istud.*" A royal proclamation followed, repeating the terms of one previously issued. Two other editions were issued in the same year, and three more followed the next year.

The very vacillations of some men of that time betokened progress; for while the waves singly fall back on the shore, the tide surely advances to its fulness. Thus William Barlow, who had changed sides more than once, and died at length Bishop of Chichester, published a dialogue against "Luthers faccions" in 1531, and in it objected to Tyndale's translation, asserting that "for the present" the Scripture should not be rendered into English. This limitation of time foreshadowed the coming of a future period when there might be an Authorized Version, and it came in six years, and was now in wide unrestricted diffusion.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

AS the text of the Bible of 1539 differed from Matthew, of which it was a revision, so the text of the Bible of 1540 differs from that of 1539, Coverdale being very conscientious in what he did, though his changes are not all to the better. Münster's Latin version is for the most part followed in the old Testament, but not always; and where it may not be formally accepted it suggests the change. Some instances are striking:¹ Proverbs xviii, 1. The edition of 1539 has, "Whoso hath pleasure to sowe dyscorde, pycketh a quarrell in every thyng," Coverdale's own translation after the Zürich Bible unchanged; in the edition of 1540, "He accompanieth hym selfe with all steadfast and helthsome doctryne, that hath a fervent desyre to it, and is sequesterate from companye," after Münster:² xix, 2, "There the soule is not well; & who so is swyfte on fote, stombleth hastely," 1539; "There the soule is inclined to the thyng that is not good; & is swyfte on fote, and offendeth," 1540, after Münster:³ xix, 19, "For greate wrath bringeth harme, therefore let hym go, and so mayest thou teach hym more nurtoure," 1539; "A man of great wrath beareth a payne; and though thou once deliver him, thou must agayne do as moch for him," 1540, after

¹ Every scholar and critic must feel deeply obliged to Mr. Francis Fry for his volume "A Description of the Great Bible," &c. London, 1865. He has given a minute, careful, and exhaustive collation of the various editions.

² Qui in votis est et quaerit sequestrari, hic immiscet se omni solidæ et sanæ (doctrinæ).

³ Anima (fertur ad id quod) non est bonum, festinatque pedibus et peccat.

Münster:¹ xix, 24, "A slouthfull body shuteth his hande in to hys bosome, so that he can not put it to his mouth," 1539; "A slouthful man shuteth his handes into his bosom as into the pot: and wyll not take payne to put it to his mouth," 1540, after Münster.²

Eccles. xi, 1, "Sende thy vitayles ouer the waters, and so shalt thou fynde them after many dayes," 1539; "Lay thy brede vpon weate faces, and so shalt thou fynde after many days," 1540, virtually after Münster:³ xi, 5, "As thou knowest not the waye of the wynde, nor how the bones are fylled in a mothers wombe," 1539; "As thou knowest not the waye of the spirit howe he entred into the body beinge yet in a mother's wombe," 1540, after Münster.⁴

Hosea x, 12, "That they myght plowe vp their fresh land, and seke the Lord, tyll he came, and lerned them ryghteousness" 1539; "Plowe up youre freshe lande, for it is tyme to seake the Lorde tyll he come and rayne rightuousnesse vpon you," 1540, Münster.⁵

Zech. ix, 16, "For the stones of his Sanctuary shal be set vp in his lande," 1539; "Ffor as precyous stones of a dyademe they shall be sett vp ouer his lande," 1540, Münster.⁶

Jeremiah viii, 4, "And turne they so farre awaye, that they neuer conuerte," 1539; "Or yf Israell repent, wyll not god turne ageyn to them?" 1540, Münster:⁷ viii, 22, "For there is no more Triacle at Gylead, and there is no Physicyon that can heale the hurte of my people," 1539; "Is there triacle at Gilead? Is ther no physycyon ther?

¹ Qui est (homo) magni furoris, portat poenam, et si eum semel liberaveris denuo id agere te oportebit.

² Abscondit piger manum suam (in sinu quasi) in olla, et dedignatur eam reducere ad os suum.

³ Mitte panem tuum super facies (emittentes) aquas.

⁴ Sicut tu nescis qua via (ingredi-

atur) spiritus in corpusculum cum adhuc est in utero pregnantis.

⁵ Novate vobis novalia, tempus enim est ad inquirendum dominum, donec veniat et pluatur super nos justitiam.

⁶ Quia ut lapides coronæ elebuntur super terram ejus.

⁷ Aut si poeniteat (Israel) et non revertetur (deus)?

Why then is not the helthe of my people recouered?" 1540, Münster.¹

Other examples may be quoted, Münster being guide:—

	1539.	1540.
1 Sam. xxi, 4, clause omitted.		thynges especiallye.
Ps. xxvii, 3, I put my trust in hym.		I put my trust in this.
6, the oblacion of thankes-geuyng.		an oblacyon with great gladnesse.
13, omitted.		I shuld vtterlye haue faynted: but that.
Isaiah i, 7, as it were with enemyes in a batayle.		as they were subverted that were alienate from the Lorde.
8, lyke a beseged cytie.		lyke a wasted cytie.
11, sacryfices vnto me?		sacrifices unto me as the Lorde?
ii, 16, vpon all shyppes of the see.		vpon all shyppes of Tharsis.
xxxviii, 10, in my least age.		when mine age was shortened.
Jer. viii, 19, foolyshe straunge fashyons?		foolysh straunge fashyons of a foreyne god?
Lam. iv, 20, shal be taken in oure synnes, of whom we saye.		was taken in ther nett of whom we saye.
Dau. v, 7, Caldees and denel conjurors.		Caldees and readers of destinies.
Nah. ii, 3, his archers are not well deckte and trimmed.		and his spere shaftes are soked in venim.

Erasmus was carefully studied for the New Testament, though several of the Erasmian renderings agree with the Vulgate. Thus—

	1639.	1540.
Rom. i, 25, which is blessed for euer.		which is to be prayed for euer.
iv, 25, for to justifie vs.		for oure justificacyon.
Gal. i, 10, Do I nowe speake vnto men or vnto God?—after the Zürich.		Do I now perswade men or God?
Eph. ii, 12, & had no hope, & were with out God in thys worlde.		hauynge no hope, and beyng with out God in thy worlde.

¹ Num resina non est in Gilead, non est recuperata sanitas filiae pot aut non est medicus ibi? quare igitur puli mei?

	1539.	1540.
Phil. i, 23, to be with Christ is moch better	to be with Christ which is moche & for better.	
29, it is geuen of Christ.	it is geuen for Chryst.	
„ but also suffre.	but also that ye shulde suffre.	
1 Tim. iii, 16, was beleued on erth.	was beleued on in the worlde.	
Heb. xi, 16, God is not ashamed.	God himselfe is not ashamed.	
James i, 13, God cannot tempte vnto euyll because he tempteth no man.	as God can not be tempted with euill, so nether he hymselfe temptethe eny man.	
2 Pet. ii, 14, exercysed with couetousnes.	exercysed with robrie.	

In the Apocalypse there are several clauses inserted, as in x, 5 (And the erth and the thynges that therein are); xii, 10, For (the accuser of our brethren) is cast doune; xviii, 23 (and candell lyght shalbe no more burnynge in the): these clauses and readings not being found in the earlier Greek editions of Erasmus nor in the versions of Tyndale and Coverdale, and the translation of them is printed in smaller type. But Erasmus admitted them into his fourth edition of 1527; in fact he inserted ninety emendations of the text of the Apocalypse on the authority of the Complutensian Polyglott. Canon Westcott has brought to light a strange fact, that portions of the editions of November, 1540, and of May, 1541, do not follow that of April, 1540, but that of 1539. It is impossible to guess who suggested this retrogression, or for what reason the first revision was preferred.

There were thus published, within a brief space, seven editions of the Great Bible—Crumwell's in 1539, and Cranmer's in April, July, and November, 1540, and in May, November, and December, 1541. These editions are very similar; the pointing hands are retained in the three first of them, and the † keeps its place in all of them. Five have sixty-two lines in a page, and two—November, 1540 and 1541—have sixty-five. At the beginning of some of the Books, in the volume of April, 1540, are large woodcut initials, which are peculiar to this edition. In the edition of November, 1540, there is only a flourished capital at the beginning of Genesis, and the pages of the New Testament are faulty in numeration. These editions have a strange

misprint in the heading of Genesis xxxix, where it is said of Joseph, "Pharaoh's wife tempteth him." The Books of the Apocrypha are called Hagiographa, and the strange reason is given, "because they were wont to be read, not openly and in common, but as it were in secret and apart." The mistake perhaps arose from a false reading in Jerome's Preface to Tobit and Judith.¹ But Martianay, Vallarsi, and other editors, have shown from manuscript authority that the true reading is Apocrypha, and that this, the proper reading, is in accordance with Jerome's own opinion on the Canon.²

Coverdale was in no way partial to his own work, but changed his earlier renderings without hesitation, though sometimes without sufficient reason. Thus, in Isaiah liii, he has made about twenty alterations on the edition of 1539;³ and in chapter xl of the same book there is on an average a change in each verse, resting, nearly every one of them, on Pagninus and Münster, and about a third of them on Münster alone. In fact, he has made most changes in the part of Matthew's Bible which was his own work, as if he had felt the insecurity of a version which was not taken directly from the original Hebrew. This Great Bible was the Authorized Version for twenty-eight years.⁴

But though it was a double revision of Matthew's of 1537, the Great Bible is not only inferior as a translation, but has interspersed through it a great variety of paraphrastic and supplementary clauses from the Vulgate, some being preserved in the Bishops'. The following examples are taken almost at random, and similar instances may be found on almost every page.

Genesis iv, 8, Cain spake with Abel hys brother [let us go furth].
xxxi, 31,² But [whereas ye layest theft to my charge] wyth
whome soeuer thou fyndest thy goddes let hym
dye.

¹ Apud Hebræos Judith quae inter Hagiographa legitur. Prolog. Gal.

² Hieronymi Opera, tom. X, p. 2, ed. Vallarsi, Venet., 1771.

³ See p. 370.

⁴ In the strict sense it is the only authorized version still—for the Bishops' Bible and the present Bible never had the formal sanction of royal authority.

- Exodus ii, 22, [And she bare yet another sonne, whome he called Eliezer, sayinge: the God of my father is myne helper, & hath ryd me out of the handes of Pharao] — after Coverdale and Matthew, the authority being some copies of the Septuagint, Vulgate, and other versions. The verse is taken from chapter xviii, 4.
- Numb. xiii, 30, Caleb stylled the [murmur that was raysted vp of] the people.
- xxii, 33, els yf she had turned from me [geuyng place to me that stode in the waye].
- Deut. i, 37, [wonderfull was that indignacyon agayn the people, seyinge that] the Lord was angry with me.
- Joshua ii, 11, as we hearde these thynges [we were sore afraied &] our heartes dyd fainte.
- iii, 13, the waters of Jordan [that are beneth, shall ronне downe] shall be deuided.
- iv, 3, twelve [of the most hardest] stones.
- ix, 9, we haue heard ye fame [of the power] of him.
- xxii, 25, Therfore we [toke better aduiseмент and] sayd.
- Judges ix, 49, so that [with smoke and fyre] all the men of the tower of Sichem were slayne.
- 2 Samuel i, 18, [And he sayde: Consyder O Israel, these that be deed and wounded upon the hye hilles.]
- vi, 12, [And there were with David seven sorts of dancers and calves for sacrifice.]
- xiv, 30, [and Joabs servauntes came with their garments rent, and sayde, Absaloms servauntes have burnte the piece of land with fyre.]
- iv, 8, corn and wine [and oyle].
- xi, 25, For [the chaunce of warre is dyuerse and] the sworde deuoureth one as well as another.
- 2 Kings v, 17, And Naaman sayd [Euen as thou wylt, but I beseche thee].¹

¹ There is a peculiar addition or mistranslation in 2 Chron. xxxvi, 8— upon him," the Bishops' adds a note: "the carved images that were laid to "marks of idolatrie found printed his charge," after Matthew, Münster in his bodie when he was dead." having "sculptæ impressiones." To

- Job xiv, 6, he maye rest [a lytle] vntyll hys daye come.
- Psalms vii, 11, God is a righteous judge [strong and pacient].
- xiii, 6, [yee I wyll prayse the name of the Lord, the most hiest.]
- xiv, 5, a great fear [even where no fear was].
- xxix, 1 Syng unto the Lorde, O ye mightie [brynge younge rammes unto the Lorde] ascrybe unto the Lorde worshippe and strengthe.
- xxxix, 11, like as it were a mothe ^{puttinge} [puttinge a garment].
- lxviii, 1, unto thee vow be performed [in Hierusalem].
- lxviii, 4, to hym that rydeth upon the heavens [as it were upon a horse.]
- cxi, [Prayse the Lorde for the returnyng agayne of Aggeus and Zachary the prophetes.]
- cxlii, 4, nor myne eye lyddes to slomber [nether the temples of my heade to take anye rest].
- cxlii, 26, [O give thanks unto the Lord of Lordes, for hys mercie endureth for ever.]

There are more than seventy such additions in the Book of Psalms.

- Prov. iii, 9, [give unto the poor.] At the end of chap. v are two long verses.
- v, 2, [apply not thyself to the deceitfulness of a woman.]
- vi, 11, [But if thou be not slowthful, thy harvest shall come as a spryngynge well, and poverty shall flye farre from thee.]
- x, 4, [whoso regardeth leasynges fedeth the wynde, and doth but followe byrdes that have taken their flyght.]

All these accretions are from the Vulgate, and they are found in both the earlier Wycliffite versions.

- Isaiah xl, 1, Comforte my people [O ye prophetes].
- Luke x, 21, That same houre reioyced Jesus in [the holy] ghoste.
- xvi, 21, [and no man gave unto him.]
- xvii, 36, [Two in the felde, the one shall be receaved and the other forsaken.]
- xxiv, 36, Peace be vnto you. [It is I, feare not.]

- John vi, 41, I am the bread [of lyfe].
 Acts v, 15, that the shadowe of Peter myght shadowe some of them [and that they myght all be delyuered from their infirmityes].
 xiv, 7, [& all the multitude was moued at their doctryne, but Paul and Barnabas taryed styll at Lystra.]
 xviii, 4, [settyng forth in the mean while the name of the Lorde Jesus.]
 Romans v, 2, the glory [of the chyl dren] of God.
 1 Cor. xvi, 19, [with whom also I am lodged.]
 Gal. v, 13, but by loue [of the sprete] serue one another.
 Phil. iv, 8, yf there be eny prase [of lernynge].
 1 John ii, 22, [he that knowelageth the Sonne hath the Father also]; but the clause is now accepted as genuine on preponderant authority.

The titles of the Psalms are sometimes expanded after the Vulgate. At Ps. xxiv the inscription is "in the first day of the sabbath," and at Ps. xlviii, "in the second daye of oure sabbathe"; but the Vulgate is not followed at Ps. xxxvii. Ps. xxvi is inscribed "a Psalm of David [afore he was embalmed]," and Ps. xxix has "a Psalm of David at the perfourmyng of the Tabernacle." At Ps. xvi, and in other places, Michtam is "the badge or armes of David." Maschil is "instructyon in the chauntes or melodyes." The Chief Musician becomes the Chaunter, or "to him that excelleth in songs of musick, or on Gittith, &c.," or "to him that excelleth among the lylyes," Ps. xlv. The poor cut prefixed to the Book of Psalms [1540] represents Bathsheba bathing in nudity, and David, with his crown on his head, intently gazing down upon her from an opposite window. The Psalms in the Book of Common Prayer are from the Great Bible, and they were retained in 1662, when the Epistles and Gospel were taken from the Authorized Version of 1611, for "the choirs were accustomed to the old Psalter, and its language was considered more smooth and fit for song."¹

¹ Proctor's History, p. 216. Mr. no such Bible; and of "Cranmer's Proctor speaks in the same paragraph "of the version of Tyndale and Coverdale, 1535," there being version of 1539," but his Bible did not appear till 1540. Many in the nation were thankful for the Bible,

The seven years—from 1534 to 1541—that intervened between the published translation of Tyndale, the volume of Matthew, and the issues and revisions of Coverdale, as well as the six following years, that ended with Henry's death, form an eventful period in the history of the English Bible. It came into national circulation during a time of stormy transition,¹ and was hailed by many as the bow in the cloud. After the earlier and more promising part of Henry's life had been passed, he was swayed alternately by opposite influences. The wars of the Roses had left suspicions and hatreds in his mind, and his throne was not surrounded by royal children, some one of whom might take the sceptre without challenge. The harder elements of his nature had been intensified by the circumstances of his reign, the separation from the Pope, the long battle of the divorce, with its "traverses and tossings," and the antagonistic views and feelings battling among his subjects,

and grateful to the king for his sanction of it. Thus Becon, in his "News from Heaven," 1451, "The most sacred and holy Bible—thanks be to God which hath brought these things to pass by his dearly beloved servant our king, Henry VIII . . . whose grace's highness I most beseech Almighty God to beautify with the benefit of perpetual health." And again, in his "Christmas Banquet, 1542," "This supply of Bibles hath God unfeignedly brought to pass by his well-beloved servant and our king, Henry VIII." But many were careless about the royal gift; "for a man may come into a church, and see the Bible so enclosed and wrapped about with dust, that with his finger he may write upon it this epitaph—Ecce nunc in pulvere dormio." Works, vol. I, p. 38, Parker Soc. ed.

¹ There were suppressed, at different times, six hundred and forty-five

monasteries, ninety colleges, two thousand three hundred and seventy-four chauntries, and one hundred and ten hospitals—their revenues, amounting to £161,100—an immense sum in present currency. Bishop Fisher himself had, in 1521, suppressed a house in his own diocese to endow New College, Oxford. College endowments taken from dissolved houses were given at an earlier period—by Bishop Wainflete to Magdalene College, and Wolsey to Cardinal College, Oxford. Bishop Alcock in the same way enriched Jesus College, Cambridge; and Bishop Smith gave the revenues of Cold Norton to Brasenose; and All Souls, Oxford, was thus supported by Chichele. During the three centuries between the Conquest and the accession of Richard II, twelve hundred religious houses had been founded in England.

the majority of whom clung to the creed, though they had renounced the jurisdiction, of Rome. The laws passed at this period indicate strange oscillations. The "Act of the Six Articles," or the "Bloody Statute," which calls itself an "Act for abolishing diversity of opinion," was, with its sanguinary penalties, a measure befriending Popery; but another Act was also passed, vesting the property of the dissolved monasteries in the crown, the king promising to set up and endow thirteen additional bishoprics. The parliament which passed the "Act of the Six Articles" was no sooner prorogued than a proclamation was issued, forbidding, on the one hand, the application of such names as papists and heretics; but, on the other hand, declaring "that the king was pleased and contented that such as could read might read the Scriptures in the English tongue, at all times and places convenient, for their own instruction and edification, and increase thereby godliness and virtuous learning, and to bring them from their old ignorance and blindness." While the public pulse was in this way beating wildly, both in assault and defence, society was appalled by scenes of "judgment without mercy"; men held their breath at the demolition of the monasteries, and the scandals brought to light in connection with many of them—such imposture as the hidden machinery that moved the Rood of Boxley. Charges of treason filled the air, and the scaffold at Tower Hill did not want victims. Bishop Fisher, who had been Lady Margaret's first Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, fell in 1534, and Sir Thomas More in 1535. The axe may be said to have been suspended in front of the royal closet, and even of the royal bridal chamber. The mighty were smitten down without remorse; no offending head was spared for its crown or its coronet. Two queens perished—one on the 19th May, 1536, and the other six years afterwards, on the 12th February, 1542. The aged "Lady of Sarum," the last of the Plantagenets, laid her grey hairs upon the block on the 27th of May, 1541. To-day the sky might be clear, but to-morrow it was darkened with thunder clouds. Familiars and councillors high in favour were helpless when the storm burst; and the hand that gave Crumwell the

patent¹ to authorize the printing of the Scriptures, signed, almost at the same moment, the death warrants of the Abbots of Reading and Glastonbury—the second of whom, an old man of fourscore, was hanged on the summit of the Torre.

For several years—indeed as far back as 1537—the reading of the Bible had been accompanied by scenes of irregularity sometimes approaching to riot. Such ebullitions of feeling were natural in the circumstances, but might have been kept under some measure of restraint. On the one side there was revelling in the new liberty, and on the other side there were dismay and indignation at the novel and formidable privilege gloried in by the people. Conflict was inevitable; the Catholic party frowned defiance, and men with the Bible in their hands scowled back with undue exultation. The fresh words of Froude narrate some of these scenes.²

"A circle of Protestants at Wincanton, in Somersetshire, wrote to Cromwell complaining of the curate, who would not teach them or preach to them, but 'gave his time and attention to dicing, carding, bowling, and the cross waster.' In their desire for spiritual food they applied to the rector of the next parish, who had come occasionally and given them a sermon, and had taught them to read the New Testament; when suddenly, on Good Friday, 'the unthrifty curate entered the pulpit, where he had set no foot for years,' and 'admonished his parishioners to give no credence to the new-fangled fellows which read the new books.' 'They be like knaves and Pharisees,' he said; 'they be like a dog that gnaweth a marry-bone, and never cometh to the pith, therefore avoid their company; and if any man will preach the New Testament, if I may hear him, I am ready to fight with him incontinent'; and 'indeed,' the petitioners said, 'he applyeth in such wise his school of fence so sore continually, that he feareth all his parishioners.'

"So the parish clerk at Hastings made a speech to the congregation on the faults of the translation. 'It taught heresy,' he said; 'it taught that a priest might have a wife by God's

¹ 26 Henry VIII, cap. 1, 13.

² Froude's History of England, vol. III, pp. 240-243.

law. He trusted to see the day that the book called the Bible, and all its maintainers and upholders, should be brent.'

"Here, again, is a complaint from the parishioners of Langham, in Essex, against their village potentate, a person named Vigors, who with the priest oppressed and ill-used them.

"Upon Ascension day last past did two maidens sit in their pew or stool in the church, as all honest and virtuous persons used to do in matins time, saying their matins together upon an English primer. Vigors this seeing was sore angry, in so much that therefore, and for nothing else, he did bid the maidens to avoid out of the church, (calling them) errant whores, with such other odious and spiteful words. And further, upon a time within this year, one of Vigors's servants did quarrel and brawl with other children many, whom he called heretics; and as children be light and wanton, they called the said servant again Pharisee. Upon this complained Robert Smyth of our town to Vigors, saying that it was against reason that the great fellow his servant should quarrel with children. Whereupon Vigors said to his servant, 'See that thou do cut off their ears, oh errant whoreson, if they so call thee hereafter; and if thou lack a knife, I shall give thee one to do it. And if thou wilt not thus do, thou shalt no longer serve me.'

"On the other hand, the Protestants gave themselves no pains to make their heterodoxy decent, or to spare the feelings of their antagonists. To call 'a spade a spade,' and a rogue a rogue, were Protestant axioms. Their favourite weapons were mystery plays, which they acted up and down the country in barns, in taverns, in chambers, on occasion, before the vicar-general himself; and the language of these, as well as the language of their own daily life, seemed constructed as if to pour scorn on the old belief. Men engaged in a mortal strife usually speak plainly. Blunt words strike home; and the euphuism which, in more ingenious ages, discovers that men mean the same thing when they say opposite things was as yet unknown or unappreciated."

These scenes were to be witnessed in various parts of the country, and they afforded to watchful enemies a tempting

opportunity to show their hostility, under pretence of guarding law, loyalty, faith, and decency of worship. Before the Act of the Six Articles was passed, the king, speaking as the head of the Church, issued a proclamation on Bible reading, which contains many excellent advices, though they are given in autocratic spirit. Some persons are accused of attempting to "bring back his subjects to the old devotion to the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome; others of wresting Scripture, and untruly alleging the same, to the subversion of law and the authority of magistrates;¹ some of them also using the Scripture permitted to them by the Kings goodnes in the English tongue, *at such times and places, and after* [much contrary to his Highnes expectation: for his Majesties intent and hope was, that they that would read the Scripture, would, with meeknes and wil to accomplish the effect of it, read it, and not to maintain erroneous opinions, and preach [them,] nor for to use the reading and preaching of it in undue time and places, and after] such fashions and sorts, as it is not convenient to be suffered. And thus each of them dispute so arrogantly against the other of their opinions, as wel in churches, ale-houses, tavernes, and other places and congregations, that there is begun and sprung among themselves slander and rayling each at other, as wel by words as writing; one part of them calling the other *Papist*, and the other part calling the other *heretic*: wherby is like to follow *sedition* [dissension] and tumult, *to their own destruction,* [not only to their own confusions, that teach and use the same, but also to the disturbance, and liklihood to destruction of al the rest of the Kings true and welbeloved subjects,] if his Majesty, like a godly and Catholick Prince, of his excellent goodnes, by his princely power and authority given him by God, should not politicly, in the beginning, provide for the same.

"For remedy wherof his most royal Majesty, by his most excellent wisdome, knowing and considering his kingly office

¹ Strype's Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. I, pt. ii, pp. 434-437. The king himself corrected this document. The word or clauses and followed by an asterisk were erased by his majesty, and those within brackets inserted by him in their place.

and charge touching the premisses, and daily painfully studying and devising, with a most noble and earnest heart, to reduce his people committed by God to his care, to unity of opinion, and to encrease love and charity among themselves, and constantly to conserve them in the same, intendeth, God willing, by advice of his Prelates and Clergy, and other of his Council, to procede to a ful order and resolution to extinct al such diversities of opinions by *terrible* [good and just] laws to be made for the same, by authority of his Parliament. . . . And over this, his Majesty straitly chargeth and commandeth, that no person, except such as be curates, or graduates in any of the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge, or such as be or shal be admitted to preach by the Kings licence, or by his Vicegerent, or by any Bishop of the realm, shal teach or preach the Bible, or New Testament, nor expound the mysteries thereof to any other; nor that any person or persons shall openly read the Bible or New Testament in the English tongue in any churches or chappels, [or elsewhere] with any loud or high voice; [and especially] during the time of divine service, or of celebrating and saying of masses: but virtually and devoutly to hear their divine services and masses, and use that time in reading and praying with peace and stilnes, as good Christen men use to do [for his own erudition] upon the like pains, as is afore rehersed. *And also* [notwithstanding] his Highnes is pleased and contented, that such as can [and wil] in the English tongue, shal and may quietly and reverently read the Bible and New Testament by themselves [secretly] at al times and places convenient for their own instruction and edification, to encrease therby godliness and vertuous learning. . . . Wherefore his Majesty chargeth and commandeth al his said subjects to use the H. Scripture in English, according to his godly purpose and gracious intent, as they would avoid his most high displeasure and indignation, beside the pain above remembred."

It is the Dean of Chichester who says that at this period "the demand for an English Bible was the political or radical cry of the age"; and certainly ecclesiastics dreaded above all an English Bible in open circulation, as if God's Book was

not the foundation and charter of God's Church. The Dean asserts also, without reserve, that "when Henry wished to intimidate the clergy, he threatened them with an authorized version," and "when he would win their favour he proscribed it."¹

The Act of Supremacy, passed in 1534,² and the Act of the Six Articles, carried through by Lord Chancellor Audley in 1539³ wrought like a double net with many fatal meshes, so that reformers and Catholics were entangled side by side, and perished at the same time—the first burned for heresy, and the second hanged for treason. If men shrank from the one danger, they were caught in the recoil by the other. As if to manifest the equality of the procedure, the victims were sometimes dragged on hurdles, two and two, a Papist and a Protestant, the Catholics asserting that this "unequal matching was worse than death itself."⁴ The statute was interpreted by "branches of inference"—so that rare attendance at mass was equivalent to speaking against it, slowness in lifting the hands "in sacring time," and gentle striking of the breast at confession, were sufficient to bring a worshipper within sweep of the law. Reading of Scripture was especially regarded as very suspicious; and in a fortnight five hundred persons were indicted in London alone. As years passed on, it was supposed that heresy might bleed to death under the ruthless hands of an English inquisition. Latimer and Shaxton were sent to prison, and were obliged to give up their dioceses. Barnes, who had been prior of the Augustinian convent at Cambridge, and the spiritual father of Coverdale, was burned at Smithfield on the 30th July, 1540,⁵ along with Jerome, and with Garrett

¹ Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, Second Series, vol. I, p. 334, &c.

² 26 Henry VIII, cap. 7 and 13.

³ 31 Henry VIII, cap. 14.

⁴ *Ipsa morte gravius et intolerabilius*. Fuller's Church History, vol. II, p. 105,

⁵ Barnes, by creating an impression that he had been drowned, had escaped and fled to the Continent, but after

he returned, in 1540, he had again indulged in personal raillery from the pulpit of St. Paul's Cross, and played upon the name of Bishop Gardiner as a "garden cock that lacked good spurs." But he soon found that the episcopal spurs were long enough and sharp enough, for he was at once arrested, and sentenced to the fire. (See page 256.)

who had taken an early and energetic part in the circulation of Tyndale's Testaments—all three having been attainted; and at the same time three priests Abel, Featherstone, and Powell, were executed with them as traitors. Between the publication of the third and fourth editions of the Great Bible, Crumwell himself, the Vicar-general and Vicegerent, the patron and promoter of Biblical translations, was beheaded. His influence for eight years had been paramount at Court, and in Parliament and Convocation: and he had possessed his earldom but one hundred days when he was attainted without scruple, and swiftly sent to death. His arms—found in the first three editions, 1539, April and July, 1540—are erased in the four last. In these earlier ones Cranmer and Crumwell are pictured each with his shield below him, but after the Vicegerent's death his figure stands alone; the heraldry was carefully erased, and the circular space is a blank.¹ Crumwell's rise had been rapid and steady, but his fall was sudden. The orphan boy of a tradesman, he was a man of rare and resolute ability, and was at one time in the service of Wolsey. He was knighted in 1531, became Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1532, Secretary of State in 1534, Vicegerent in 1535, a Baron and Master of the Rolls in 1536, the Garter and the Deanery of Wells were given him in 1537. He rose to be Great Chamberlain, and was created Earl of Essex on the 17th of April, 1540; and he was beheaded on the 28th of July. The Lincolnshire and Yorkshire rebels, during "the Pilgrimage of grace," had prayed that, as he was of "villein's" blood, he should be removed from the council; but the king bluntly told them they "were but brutes" and inept, and could not judge in such matters. His garter gave great offence to the old nobility. He had tried to entrap Gardiner under the Act of Supremacy; but the bishop easily eluded the danger. Crumwell suffered under a law which himself had carried through the year before—to wit, that a person named in a bill of attainder might be condemned without trial. His connection with heretical books and men was a strong charge against him. The edition of November, 1540,

¹ See p. 362.

with the melancholy memento of Crumwell's fallen greatness, is the first bearing the names of Tunstall and Heath. Among the many surprises of the period, the occurrence of these names in such a connection is not the least; for Tunstall had been the Bible burner—the same "My Lord of London" into whose house Tyndale vainly asked admission, and who afterwards gathered and gave to the flames so many copies of his translation. Crumwell had been executed, and lest the Bible in which he had taken such an interest might draw suspicion upon itself, and sink in popular esteem, episcopal revision and authority are set in prominence, by royal command, on the front of two editions. The title-page bears the declaration, "Oversene and perused at the commandment of the Kynges Highnes, by the ryghte reverende fathers in God, Cuthbert, Bishop of Duresme, and Nicolas, Bishop of Rochester." The full title of the editions of November, 1540 and 1541, is—

"The Byble in Englyshe of the largest and greatest volume, auctorysed and apoynted by the commaundemente of oure moost redoubted Prynce, and soueraygne Lorde Kyng Henry the VIII, supreme heade of this his Churche and Realme of Englande: to be frequented and used in euery churche within this his sayd realme accordynge to the tenour of his former iniunctions given in that behalfe. Oversene and perused at the commaundmente of the Kynges Hyghnes, by the ryght reverende fathers in God, Cuthbert bysshop of Duresme, and Nicolas bisshop of Rochester. Printed by Edwarde Whitchurch. Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum." Colophon: "The ende of the newe Testamente and of the whole Byble. Fynyshed in November, Anno MCCCCXL. A domino factum est istud." Of course the other edition has MCCCCXLI.

The Act of 1538 had commanded that all published books of Scripture should have the sanction of the king, a privy councillor, or a bishop. These two bishops had certainly no heart to the work, and the belief was that they had not revised the version as they professed. But they durst not thwart the king, and they gave their names to a virtual imposture, so far as the title-page is concerned.

Tunstall, one of the episcopal editors of the Great Bible,

was a scholar of eminence. When Pole, in a letter to the king, wished him to allow Tunstall to read his book *De Unitate*, he calls the bishop "a sad and learned man"; and More, in the *Utopia*, styles him "a man doubtless out of comparison," and in his Epitaph he describes him as so "excelling in learning, wit, and virtue, that the whole world scant hath at this day any more learned, wiser, or better." Tunstall was a pupil of Grocyn, but he could have had no great leisure for study after he entered public life, for, with rapid promotion in the church, he filled a succession of public or civil offices—Vicar-General to Warham in 1508, Master of the Rolls in 1516, Keeper of the Privy Seal in 1523, besides being Ambassador to the Archduke Charles, to Charles V in 1516, at Worms in 1519, to Francis I in 1527-29, and, with More, at Cambray in 1529. He became Bishop of London in 1522, was translated to Durham in 1530, was finally deprived in 1559, and committed, at the age of eighty-four, to the custody of the Archbishop of Canterbury. He had permitted no persecution in his diocese of Durham, and, according to Strype, he was before his death, by the Archbishop's kindness and conversation, "brought off from papistical errors." He had been godfather to Elizabeth when he baptized her at Greenwich in 1533; and on the coronation of Mary he stood at the queen's right hand.

Some years afterwards, or in 1546, there was published "The Supplication of the Poor Commons to the King," and the story there stated is not beyond the bounds of belief. "We heard say that they proffered your Highness, that if you would please to call in the Bible again, forasmuch as it was not faithfully translated in all parts, they would oversee it, and within seven years set it forth again. Your bishops, most victorious Prince, if they might have gotten in the Bible for seven years, would have trusted that, by that time, either your Highness should have been dead, or the Bible forgotten: or they themselves out of your Highness' reach; so that you should not have like power over them as you have now. . . . When your Majesty appointed two of them (Tunstall and Heath) to overlook the translation of the Bible, they said they had done your Highness' commandment therein: yea, they set their names there-

unto: but when they saw the world somewhat like to wring on the other side, they denied it, and said they never meddled therewith, causing the printer to take out their names, which were erst set before the Bible, to certify to all men that they had diligently perused it, according as your Highness had commanded."¹

Grafton had risked five hundred pounds in the first edition of 1539, and in the six subsequent editions no small amount of capital must have been embarked—probably towards fifty thousand pounds sterling of present value. The expense of these last editions was defrayed, wholly or partially, by Anthony Marler, a haberdasher in London, who also presented to his Majesty a magnificent copy on vellum, with an inscription. This Bible is still preserved in the British Museum. The minutes of the Privy Council are significant. "Greenwich, 25th April; it was agreed that Anthony Marler of London, merchant, might sell the Bibles of the Great Bible unbound for xs. sterling, and bound, being trimmed with bullyons, for xiiis. sterling"—the first being equal to about £7, and the second to £9 of present value. But copies were lying on his hands, and he might be "undone for ever," as he complains. The best way, therefore, to reimburse the petitioner was to help the volumes off his hands; and a proclamation was issued on the 7th of May, 1540, which ordered all churches to provide themselves with a Bible of the largest volume, and another on the 6th of May, 1541, went fully into the subject:²

" . . . The which godly commandment and injunction was to the only intent that every of the King's Majesty's loving subjects, minding to read therein, might, by occasion thereof, not only consider and perceive the great and ineffable omnipotent power, promise, justice, mercy, and goodness of Almighty God; but also to learn thereby to observe God's commandments, and to obey their Sovereign Lord, and high powers, and to exercise godly charity, and to use themselves according to their vocations, in a pure and sincere Christian life, without murmur or grudging: By the which injunctions,

¹ Strype, vol. I, pt. i, p. 612.

² Burnet, vol. I, pt. ii, p. 377.

the King's Royal Majesty intended that his loving subjects should have and use the commodities of the reading of the said Bibles, for the purpose above rehearsed, humbly, meekly, reverently, and obediently, and not that any of them should read the said Bibles with high and loud voices, in time of the celebration of the holy mass, and other divine services used in the Church; or that any his lay subjects reading the same, should presume to take upon them any common disputation, argument, or exposition of the mysteries therein contained; but that every such layman should, humbly, meekly, and reverently read the same for his own instruction, edification, and amendment of his life, according to God's holy word therein mentioned. And notwithstanding the King's said most godly and gracious commandment and injunction, in form as is aforesaid, his Royal Majesty is informed that divers and many towns and parishes within this his realm, have neglected their duties in the accomplishment thereof, whereof his Highness marvelleth not a little; and minding the execution of his said former most godly and gracious injunctions, doth straitly charge and command that the curats and parishioners of every town and parish within this his realm of England, not having already Bibles provided within their parish churches, shall, on this side the Feast of All-Saints next coming, buy and provide Bibles of the largest and greatest volume, and cause the same to be set and fixed in every one of the said parish churches, there to be used as is aforesaid, according to the said former injunctions, upon pain that the curat and inhabitants of the parishes and towns, shall lose and forfeit to the King's Majesty, for every month that they shall lack and want the said Bibles, after the same feast of All-Saints, 40s., the one half of the same forfeit to be to the King's Majesty, and the other half to him or them which shall first find and present the same to the King's Majesties Council. And finally, the King's Royal Majesty doth declare and signify to all and singular his loving subjects, that to the intent they may have the said Bibles of the greatest volume, at equal and reasonable prices, his Highness, by the advice of his Council, hath ordained and taxed that the sellers thereof shall not

take for any of the said Bibles unbound, above the price of ten shillings; and for every of the said Bibles well and sufficiently bound, trimmed and clasped, not above twelve shillings, upon pain the seller to lose, for every Bible sold contrary to his Highness's proclamation, four shillings; the one moiety thereof to the King's Majesty, and the other moiety to the finder and presenter of the defaulter, as is aforesaid. . . .

"God save the KING."

The price was fixed at the terms suggested by Marler. The measure was a strange one, and the language of the proclamation sounds very oddly when the subject is the Word of God. The fixing down of the price of copies, the stepping in of the law between buyer and seller, and the employment of informers, were in accordance with the false notions of political economy current at that epoch. If a man were fined for not having bought a Bible, he was not likely to regard the volume with special affection. Another plan to secure a wide circulation was apparently not thought of—namely, to print the book in smaller and cheaper form.

The title-page of the last volume of this series of the Great Bible, December, 1541, by its distinct declaration of being the authorized Bible, as in the edition of April, 1540, and by its translation of the Latin motto, seems to glance back at the two editions "overseen" by Tunstall and Heath—

"The Byble in Englishe, that is to saye, the content of all the holy scrypture both of the olde and newe testament, with a prologe therinto, made by the reverende father in God, Thomas archebisshop of Cantorbury. ¶ This is the Byble appoynted to the use of the Churches. ¶ Printed by Rycharde Grafton. Cum priuilegio ad imprimendum solum An. do. MDXL." The colophon is—"The ende of the Newe Testament, and of the whole Bible, Fynysshed in December MCCCCXLI. † A domino factum est istud. This is the Lordes Doynge." The pointing hands disappeared after Crumwell's death.

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE circulation of the Bible by royal command went on with increased speed, and even Edmund Bonner, in his unaccountable zeal, and as he had promised to Grafton in Paris, commanded his archdeacon by letter, on the 11th of May, 1542, to execute the royal mandate, and issued this Injunction:—

"By the authority given to me of God, and by our said Sovereign Lord the King's Majesty, I exhort, require, and command, that every parson, vicar, and curat, shall read over and diligently study every day one chapter of the Bible, and that with the gloss ordinary, or some other doctor or expositor, approved and allowed in this Church of England, proceeding from chapter to chapter, from the beginning of the Gospel of Matthew, to the end of the New Testament; and the same so diligently studied to keep still and retain in memory, and to come to the rehearsal and recital thereof, at all such time and times as they, or any of them, shall be commanded thereunto by me, or any of my officers or deputies."¹

Bishop Bonner also set up six Bibles in St. Paul's.² Latimer ordered a copy to be chained in the monastery of Worcester, and Hooper directed every church to have a Bible, and the

¹ Vol. I, pt. ii, p. 381.

² Many readers may have seen Sir George Harvey's picture "The Reading of the Bible in old St. Paul's." The person figured as reading to an eager group around him represents John Porter, "a fresh young man, and of a big stature, who could read well, and had an audible voice."

Bonner and his chaplains rebuked him; but he quietly replied to the bishop that he had done nothing "contrary to his advertisements which had been fixed in print over every Bible." He was then sent to Newgate, and tortured so terribly that he soon died in his dungeon. Foxe, vol. V, p. 452.

early opponent of Erasmus, Lee, now Archbishop of York, ordered all curates to provide a Bible within forty days, and have it chained in some open place in the Church. But abuses crept in; people read mostly during service and sermon, and Bonner, "for the said abuses," threatened "to take down the said Bibles." In September of the same year, in imitation of Crumwell's address on the same subject in 1538, and of the king's in the previous year, he issued an admonition to all readers of the Bible in the English tongue, to bring with them "discretion, honest intent, charity, reverence, and quiet behaviour, that there should be no such number meet together there as to make a multitude; that no such exposition be made therefrom but what is declared in the book itself; that it be not read with noise in time of divine service; and that no disputation or contention be used at it."

After the death of Crumwell, who was so cordially detested by the Catholic leaders and partizans, the enemies of the English Scripture raised their heads. The text had been authorized, but the "Notes" had not been appended. Yet, according to Foxe, Grafton, on being called before the authorities, and questioned strictly about the proposed annotations, was sent to prison for six weeks, and bound over in £300 to sell or print no more Bibles.

The Great Bible of December, 1541, was therefore the last edition printed in the reign of Henry, for a reaction had set in, and the royal mind was sinking into indifference, if not into hostility, to the English Scriptures.

There had thus been for some years a supply of English Scriptures in the country, but the result had not been satisfactory to the Catholic interest. Papal authority had been more and more undermined, theological questions were freely discussed, and in the light of the Bible many Catholic doctrines and practices were condemned, and ceased to command faith and obedience on the part of hundreds who were secretly or more openly nonconformists. The Book was in wide circulation, and it could not now be suppressed or gathered into bundles and burned. The name of Tyndale was odious to all papal adherents; and he had "suf-

ferred trouble as an evildoer, even unto bonds" and death; Coverdale was little less obnoxious, for he had been patronized by Crumwell, whose overthrow and death had been chiefly compassed by Bishop Gardyner and the faction that clung to him as their life and their leader; and Thomas Matthew or John Rogers was also well known for his sturdy and courageous character, so that all the Scriptures in use were tainted in their source and authorship, and could not be forgiven by bigoted, or accepted by conscientious, vassals of the Romish Church, and they at this time formed a majority of the people. But if the English Bible could not be withheld, as it had enjoyed royal license, it might be transformed and so modified as to serve the aims of ecclesiastical intolerance. If it could not be rudely plucked out of the people's hand, it might be taught to utter an uncertain sound, or it might be so veiled in its renderings as to be brought into unison with the traditions and service of the Church. The purpose formed, in these circumstances, by the more astute members of the hierarchy was to produce a volume of their own, which should have no heretical pravity about it, but should so commend itself to the nation as perhaps to win many back to the old paths, and thrust out its predecessors by its superior popularity, and the priestly authority which should sanction and hallow it. The familiar Latin version consecrated by long use was to be the one means of correction; and the omission of any reference to the Greek text throws a direct light on the motives of the contrivers of this reactionary enterprise. The motion of Gardyner is self-explanatory. The sacerdotal authorities hoped to mould the English Bible into ecclesiastical form, and to deprave its popular English speech with Latin terms unintelligible save to the educated.

The plot was ripe when Convocation met in the early part of 1542. Proposals were made, in the king's name, for a new translation. Cranmer obeyed the royal order, though he had seen the good work already fall through the Bishops' hands, who had not only no heart to it, but were ready to mar and impede it. It was decided in the Upper House that the Great Bible should be revised "according to that Bible which is usually

read in the English Church," that is, the Vulgate. There were some honest minds among the party, and how did they hope to effect a thorough revision by the mere aid of the Latin version? But the scheme was agreed to, and the work was thus apportioned, the New Testament being given to the Bishops, and the Old Testament to members of the Lower House. Fuller copied from the Records of the Convocation (since destroyed) the order of distribution, which was as follows:—St. Matthew—Archbishop Cranmer; St. Mark—Longland, Bishop of Lincoln; St. Luke—Gardyner, Bishop of Winchester; St. John—Goodrich, Bishop of Ely; Acts of Apostles—Heath, Bishop of Rochester; Romans—Sampson, Bishop of Chichester; 1 and 2 Corinthians—Capon, Bishop of Sarum; Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians—Barlow, Bishop of St. David's; 1 and 2 Thessalonians—Bell, Bishop of Worcester; 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon—Parfew, Bishop of St. Asaph; 1 and 2 Peter—Holgate, Bishop of Llandaff; Hebrews—Skyp, Bishop of Hereford; St. James, 1, 2, and 3 John, and Jude—Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster; Revelation—Wakeman, Bishop of Gloucester, and Chambers, Bishop of Peterboro'. The name of Tunstall does not appear on the list.

On February 13th, the Lower House sent up to the Archbishop and Bishops a list of places which in their opinion needed emendation, and Convocation then appointed joint-committees to consult as to the best means and method of revising the entire Scriptures. The Old Testament committee consisted of Lee, Archbishop of York; Goodrich, Bishop of Ely; Redmayne, afterwards Master of Trinity College, Cambridge; Taylor, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln; Heynes, afterwards Dean of Exeter; Robertson, afterwards Dean of Durham; Cox, afterwards Bishop of Ely; and others. The New Testament committee consisted of Tunstall, Bishop of Durham; Gardyner, Bishop of Winchester; Skyp, Bishop of Hereford; Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster;¹ Dr. Wotton,

¹ On the dissolution of the religious houses, in 1539, in an Act drawn by his own hand, and passed, the king took power to erect new bishoprics. Twenty-one were intended, but six only were founded and endowed out of the rich spoils. The abbey and monastery of St. Peter was dissolved

afterwards Dean of Canterbury; Dr. Day, afterwards Bishop of Chichester; Dr. Coren, Archdeacon of Oxford; Dr. Wilson; Dr. Leighton; Dr. May, Dean of St. Paul's; and others.

At the sixth meeting Gardyner handed in a list of about ninety-nine Latin words which should be retained in their original form, "for their genuine and native meaning, and for the majesty of the matter in them contained," or "be fitly Englished with the least alteration." The strange list is as follows:—"Ecclesia, Pœnitentia, Pontifex, Ancilla, Contritus, Holocausta, Justitia, Justificare, Idiota, Elementa, Baptizare, Martyr, Adorare, Dignus, Sandalium, Simplex, Tetrarcha, Sacramentum, Simulacrum, Gloria, Confictationes, Ceremonia, Mysterium, Religio, Spiritus Sanctus, Spiritus, Merces, Confiteor Tibi Pater, Panis propositionis, Communio, Perseverare, Dilectus, Sapientia, Pietas, Presbyter, Lites, Servus, Opera, Sacrificium, Benedictio, Humilis, Humilitas, Scientia, Gentilis, Synagoga, Ejicere, Misericordia, Complacui, Increpare, Distribueretur orbis, Inculpatus, Senior, Apocalypsis, Satisfactio, Contentio, Conscientia, Peccatum, Peccator, Idolum, Prudentia, Parabola, Magnifico, Oriens, Subditus, Didrachma, Hospitalitas, Episcopus, Gratia, Charitas, Tyrannus, Concupiscentia, Cisera, Apostolus, Apostolatus, Egenus, Stater, Societas, Zizania, Christus, Conversari, Profiteor, Impositio manuum, Idolatria, Inenarrabilis, Infidelis, Paganus, Commilito, Virtutes, Dominationes, Throni, Potestates, Hostia."¹ The adoption of Gardyner's² suggestion would have sadly marred the revision, and

in January, 1540, and the abbot became a dean; twelve prebendaries succeeded the monks, and Thirlby was consecrated on the 15th December, 1540, the first bishop, with a diocese including the whole of Middlesex except Fulham. Queen Mary upset all this arrangement; the monks were restored, and Feckenham was the last mitred abbot of England. Memorials of Westminster

Abbey, by Dean Stanley, p. 450. London, 1868.

¹ Fuller's Church History, vol. II, p. 108.

² Gardyner, notwithstanding his domineering dispute with Cheke on Greek pronunciation, was no mean scholar. At college, in Cambridge, he joined the party of the "Ciceronians"; and as Chancellor of the University he lent his influence to

made it as incongruous and un-English as the Rhemish version. Gardyner could not have selected his words at random, though some of them, "fitly Englished," were already in the Great Bible, and many of them are no longer novelties in the language, as justice, justify, elements, baptize, mystery, adore, glory, spirit, apostle, confession, prudence, gentile, humility, communion, perseverance, synagogue, grace, charity. Other words have no special meaning attached to them, as idiota, ancilla, egenus, humilis, ejicere, oriens, which, if they had been preserved, would have disfigured any translation. But the indifferent words were probably only a cover for the more distinctive ecclesiastical terms. The project was, without doubt, the fruit of Gardyner's ingenuity, but he outwitted himself. Cranmer at once saw through the scheme, and after consulting with the king, on Friday, 10th March, he announced it to be the royal "will and pleasure" that the translation should be examined by both universities. The bishops, with the exception of Goodrich of Ely, and Barlow of St. Davids, vehemently protested that learning had decayed at the universities, and that all things were carried by "young men, the regent's masters," so that the "learning of the land was chiefly in the Convocation"; but Cranmer "stuck close" to the king's resolution. The conspiracy was in this way easily baffled, and no further attempt was made to papalize the Authorized Version, and put a foreign mask on its honest every man's English. Convocation was not again troubled with the subject, and the Universities put no hand to the work. Yet on Sunday, the 12th of the month before Convocation broke up, a royal proclamation was issued, giving to Marler, "himself or his assigns," for four years, the "sole right to print the Bible in our English tongue," and sternly prohibiting all interference on the part of "subjects or strangers" with the monopoly.¹ As the project of the bishops to get a new version might, if carried out, have injured Marler's interests, and neutralized all previous proclamations, the king, therefore,

the introduction of new studies, in Trinity Hall in 1520, and Bishop of opposition to Aristotle and the Winchester in 1531.

Schoolmen. He became Master of ¹ Patent Rolls, 33 Henry VIII.

in sharp and imperative terms, forbade such a result. The proclamation implies perhaps that the king and Cranmer were aware of, or suspected greatly, more in the episcopal movement than has come to light. But Marler did not print or publish any more folio Bibles; indeed no others were printed in Henry's reign, though it lasted four years longer.

The portion of the nation that could read had now been furnished with the Divine Word in their "maternal tongue." During the last five years there had been issued at least twelve editions of the entire Bible—ten in folio and two in quarto—each impression probably averaging 1,500 copies. Thousands of copies of the New Testament, from 1526 and onwards, were also in use through the country. Becon, who had heard Latimer proving in his sermon delivered at Cambridge, in 1526, that the Holy Scriptures ought to be read in the English tongue by all Christian people, was now enabled, sixteen years after, to record "there is no realm throughout Christendom that hath so many urgent, weighty, and necessary causes to give thanks unto God as we Englishmen have at this present. . . . The most sacred Bible is freely permitted to be read of every man in the English tongue. . . . Many savour Christ aright, and daily the number increaseth."¹ Still there must have been a great disproportion between all this free circulation of expensive Bibles and the masses of the people—"What were these among so many?"

But the reaction indicated in Gardyner's proposal grew more powerful, and the king was brought more fully under perverse influences,² wielded by some of the adherents of the old religious party which had sullenly bowed to the separation from Rome, but was still in heart thoroughly opposed to the open circulation of the Word of God, and really terrified by it. The circulation of Scripture could not now be easily fettered; but the reading of it might be placed under legal re-

¹ Early Works, p. 180, &c., Parker Society ed.

² The common phrase that the reaction took place in the king's mind in his old age rather tends to mislead.

Henry VIII died at what should now be called the early age of fifty-six, and his father had died at fifty-two. Of his two great rivals, Francis died at fifty-three and Charles at fifty-nine.

straint. Indeed, the king had more than once complained of scenes of disorder connected with the reading of Scripture, and Parliament had said that people "wrangled over it in ale-houses," and that it was degraded "in rhymes, printed ballads, plays, songs, and other fantasies." One form of abuse, which had been already forbidden, was peculiar—the reading of the New Testament aloud during divine service. It is, indeed, little matter of surprise that a man with an English New Testament in his hand should look into it during a long Latin service, not one word of which he understood; but to disturb others around him was wholly unwarranted. Three persons of St. Albans parish were "prosecuted for disturbing the service of the church, with brabbling of the New Testament"; and one, William Plane, was taken hold of "for loud reading of the English Testament." Such a scene, in the village of Vassy, in France, led, in 1562, to bloodshed, when, the Duke of Guise being the avenger, sixty people were killed and two hundred wounded—the first of those massacres that crowned their atrocity on the day of St. Bartholomew.

At an earlier period¹ the reading of the English Bible had been sadly abused—conceited and opinionative men made it their text-book, and ignorant men, of extreme opinions, disdainfully tossed its verses in the faces of opponents. It is no less true, as already stated, that many readers of the Bible in rural parishes were frowned upon and insulted, the book being fraught with terror to reactionary ecclesiastics.² The inference, in high quarters, from all such agitations was, that none should read it but those who might be supposed to profit by it. Such a distinction was attempted by the politicians and the priesthood, not because they held the Word in supreme regard, and sought to keep it from desecration; but because they had seen the results of its circulation in advancing freedom of opinion, and in diminishing attachment to the Romish ritual and observances. Those who read the Scripture and felt its

¹ See page 389, &c.

² Sir John Gates, who suffered under Queen Mary, in 1553, for his connection with the misdoings of the Duke of Northumberland, confessed on the scaffold that he had been a great reader of Scripture, but not to his edification.

power, turned instinctively to the cross rather than to the altar with its Latin service, opened their hearts more to God and less in confession to the priest, put themselves under the inspired teaching of the Bible rather than under sacerdotal authority.¹ "It is plain," wrote Cranmer, referring to papal errors and ceremonies, "that the Word of God hath got the upper hand of them all." In alarm at this growing revolution, caused mainly by free Scripture reading, a species of discrimination was tried between such as might, and such as might not read the Word of God, and Parliament, no doubt under ecclesiastical inspiration, passed an Act in 1543, for the "Advancement of true religion"² in the following terms:

"That all manner of books of the Old and New Testament in English, of this (Tyndale's) translation should by authority of this act clearly and utterly be abolished and extinguished, and forbidden to be kept and used in this realm or elsewhere, in any of the king's dominions." . . . "That the Bible and Testaments in English not being in Tyndale's translations, should stand in force and not be compromised in this abolition or act. Nevertheless, if there should be found in any such Bibles or New Testaments, any annotations or preambles, that then the owners of them should cut or blot the same in such wise as they cannot

¹ Dr. London, who had been busy years before in the search at Oxford (see p. 165), had shown some activity in the abolition of monasteries, and had fallen into immoral scandals. He was now a prebendary of St. Georges, Windsor, and in furious zeal against Bible-readers, he had laid an accusation against four of the citizens, three of whom were burned. But in trying to entrap some gentlemen of the royal household, he committed perjury, was degraded, pilloried, and sent to the Fleet prison, where he died. This same zealot, when commissary at Oxford, had, in 1528, in

his intense desire to catch Master Garret, consulted an "astronomer, by whom a figure was made"; and the oracle declared that the fugitive had "fled in a hairy coat south-eastward." London tells this story openly to Archbishop Warham, on the 21st of February, thus pleading guilty himself to a capital crime, and making the primate so far a party to it, if he acted on the information so obtained. London was also a tool in the hands of Gardynier in the plot against Cranmer. Strype, *Memorials*, vol. I, p. 581; *Life of Cranmer*, vol. I, p. 245.

² 34 and 35 Henry VIII, cap. 1.

be perceived or read, on pain of losing or forfeiting for every Bible or Testament forty shillings (or equal to £30), provided that this article shall not extend to the blotting any quotations or summaries of any chapters in any Bible." . . . "That no manner of persons, after the 1st of October, should take upon them to read openly to others in any church or open assembly, within any of the king's dominions, the Bible or any part of the Scripture in English, unless he was so appointed thereunto by the king, or by any ordinary, on pain of suffering one hundred months' imprisonment. The Chancellor of England, Captains of the Wars, the King's Justices, the Recorders of any city, borough, or town, and the Speaker of Parliament may use any part of the Holy Scripture as they have been wont." And "every nobleman and gentlewoman, being a householder, may read or cause to be read, by any of his family, servants in his house, orchard, or garden, to his own family, any text of the Bible; and also every merchantman, being a householder, and any other persons, other than women, apprentices, &c., might read to themselves privately the Bible. But no women, except noblewomen and gentlewomen, might read to themselves alone; and no artificers, apprentices, journeymen, servingmen of the degrees of yeomen (officers in the king's family between servants and grooms), husbandmen or labourers, were to read the New Testament to themselves or to any other, privately or openly, on pain of one month's imprisonment."¹

The absurdities, contradictions, and impossibilities contained in this enactment almost exceed belief. Tyndale's translation was expressly forbidden, and yet though it was stigmatized as "crafty, false, and untrue," it had imbedded itself in the versions

¹ 34 Henry VIII, cap. 1. Statutes be for a month or two observed; at large. And yet in 1544, the king says in a royal mandate, "We have set forth certain godly prayers and suffrages in our native English tongue, to the setting forward of the glory of God, and the true worshiping of His most holy name, not to be for a month or two observed; but that the people, feeling the godly taste thereof, may gladly and joyously with thanks receive and embrace the same." This translation of the Litany was the germ of the Book of Common Prayer.

which were allowed to circulate. The Bible might be read in private by the higher classes; but plebeians were not to taste the forbidden luxury. The industrial myriads were put under ban, and God's Word was not to be polluted by their vulgar breath. Members of the peerage were tolerated, but others of lower degree might not touch the hem of His robe. The Book permitted to the patrician was forbidden to those of inferior station, as if both had not been "made of one blood," or had not been in the same need of the "common salvation"; as if under such a sumptuary regulation, rags and homespun put a man beyond the pale of divine regard, and velvet and brocade were identical with the "wedding garment." The study of the Life of the carpenter's Son—of Him who Himself used hammer and hatchet—was cruelly refused to craftsmen and artizans, "earning their bread in the sweat of their face"; and the records of the religion of Him whom "the common people heard gladly" would have become the monopoly of peers and gentry. The insane prohibition did not last many years, but it must have created no little jealousy, confusion, and evasion among the masses, on whom the brand of disqualification had been so visibly stamped. The old taunt had been "Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him," implying that the learned aristocracy as a body rejected him; but the further insolent and uncharitable censure, "this people that knoweth not the law are cursed," though unjust in Judea, would have come to be true in England if this Act had been carried out for any length of time.

The change from freedom to restriction in the reading of the Bible is indicated also in another way. In the dedication by the prelates to the king of "The Institution of a Christian Man" (1537), they "give thanks unto Almighty God, that it hath pleased Him to send such a king to reign over us, which so earnestly mindeth to set forth among his subjects the light of Holy Scripture." But in 1543 the restriction is alluded to by the king himself in his proclamation that forms the preface to the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man,"¹ which is a fuller edition of the previous

¹ London, Thomas Berthelet, 1543.

treatise.¹ After granting that the clergy should have the Bible, the royal words in reference to the laity are, "It ought to be deemed certainly, that the reading of the Old and New Testament is not so necessary for all those folks, that of duty they ought, and be bound to read, but as the prince and policy of the realm shall think convenient, so to be tolerated or taken from it. Consonant whereunto the politic law of our realm hath now restrained it from a great many, esteeming it sufficient for those so restrained to hear and truly bear away the doctrine of Scripture taught by the preachers, and so imprint the lessons of the same, that they may observe and keep them inwardly in their heart."² But this graduated toleration must have defeated its own ends, for the law could be evaded in hundreds of ways, so that three years afterwards, on the 8th of July, 1546, the Act was renewed in a more relentless and sweeping form: "No man or women, of what estate, condition, or degree, was after the last day of August to receive, have, take, or keep, Tyndale's or Coverdale's New Testament." Other works were also condemned: the whole Bible of Miles Coverdale, and the works of Fryth, Wycliffe, Joye, Roye, Turner, Tracy, &c., and were to be delivered up to be burned, the only mercy allowed being that "no bishop, chancellor, commissary, mayor, bailiff, sheriff, or constable, shall be curious to mark who bringeth forth such books." In December, 1546, a year before his death, and on his last personal meeting with his Parliament, the king, calling himself God's "vicar and high minister here," for he had taken the place of the Pope, complains of abuses in Bible reading: "For the book was disputed, rhymed, sung, and jangled in every alehouse and tavern, contrary to the true meaning and doctrine of the same." The royal discourse was touching, the king wept, and many of his audience were in tears, and yet, such was the perverseness of the times that, after this last and earnest discourse on charity, "spoken so sententiously, so kingly, or rather fatherly," the next dark tragedy of his closing reign was the cruel martyrdom of Anne Askew, who had often been seen reading the Bible in

¹ London, 1537.

reign of Henry VIII, ed. Cardwell,

² Formularies of Faith during the Oxford, 1825.

the aisles of Lincoln Cathedral, and who, after sentence of death had been pronounced upon her, was so tortured on the rack, that she had to be carried to the stake, at which she was burned with three companions. Bonner, Wriothesly, Rich, and Gardyner (the king being apparently passive), were the chief agents in this lady's heartless murder.¹

But, though the true remedy was not to forbid the study or possession of a Bible, it was resolved to put the divine book out of existence, though fire had failed before, Bonner, who had been so kind to Coverdale and Grafton in Paris, while they were superintending the press, and who had helped to transmit to England the endangered sheets of the Great Bible, took naturally to the pastime of Bible burning. Numerous copies must have perished, and to prevent identification the title-pages of many must have been torn off. The "Supplication of the Poor Commons"² offers this comment:—"The remnant of the sturdy beggars not yet weeded out," they say, "tell us that vice, uncharitableness, lack of mercy, diversity of opinions and other like enormities, have reigned ever since men had the Scriptures in English. And what is this, other than to cause men's consciences to abhor the same, as the only cause and original of all this? They say it sufficeth a layman to believe as they teach, and not to meddle with the interpretation of Scripture; and what meaneth that, but that they would have us as blind again as we were? They have procured a law that none shall be so hardy as to have the Scripture in his house, unless he may spend £10 by the year" (*i. e.*, equal to £150 now), "and what meaneth this but that they would famish the souls of the residue, withholding their food from them? Had God put immortal souls in none other, but such as be possessioners in this world? Did not Christ send word to John the Baptist that the poor received the Gospel?—Why do these men disable them from reading of the Scriptures, that are not endued with the possessions of this world? Undoubtedly, most gracious Sovereign, because they are the very same

¹ See page 195.

² There was also printed with it, which appeared originally many years before. Strype's Memorials, "The Supplication of Beggars," vol. I, pt. I, p. 608, Oxford, 1832.

that shut up the kingdom of heaven before men. They enter not in themselves; nor suffer they them to enter that would. They are like to a cur dog lying in a cock of hay: for he will eat none of the hay himself, nor suffer any other beast that comes to eat thereof."¹

The statement of Mr. Anderson, that Tunstall and Heath omitted the motto "*A Domino factum est istud*" is not according to fact.² It occurs in both editions—twice, indeed, in that of 1540, at the end of the colophon and at the end of the Table.

¹ The following is an example of the pray God amende that blyndness. working of the Act, the note being Wryt by Robert Wyllyams, keppeying found on a spare leaf of a copy of shepe upon Seynbury hill, 1546." Polydore Vergil's "History of Invention." "When I kepe Mr. Letymers This book had been printed by Grafton during the same year. Camden's Annal, ed. Hearne, vol. I, shepe I bout thys boke when the p. xxx. Testament was oberragated, that shepeherdys myght not rede hit. I ² See p. 395.

CHAPTER XXX.

SCOTTISH History, contemporary with the last years of Henry VIII, and the circulation of the Great Bible in his kingdom, has many stirring incidents. Scotland produced no divine or scholar that engaged in the sacred and responsible work of translation. The supply of Bibles therefore came from beyond the realm; but the enmity of the popish ecclesiastics was as rancorous against the English Scriptures in the north as it was in the south. Cardinal Beaton had at this time prepared a list of intended victims, to the number of more than a hundred of the nobility and gentry, because, in the words of Sir Ralph Sadler, the English Ambassador, they were "gentlemen all well minded to God's Word"—the Earl of Arran, heir-presumptive to the crown, being among the number. The king could not stand even the sight of the list; but the ecclesiastics, alarmed at the proposed interview of James with his uncle, Henry VIII, pledged themselves to grant him an enormous sum of money if he would give them a secular judge to sentence criminals, for there were "many thousands who did not hesitate to study the books both of the Old and New Testament." The reading of the New Testament at this period is frequently referred to; and the authorities, so alarmed and blindly wrathful, ordered that all persons having the books, the importation of which both by foreigners and natives had been now forbidden by statute, should deliver them up to their ordinary, on pain of confiscation and imprisonment. Especially the reading of the New Testament in the vulgar tongue was for-

mally denounced and prohibited.¹ That such an act should have been deemed necessary shows that there must have been throughout the country numerous copies of the New Testament, and numerous students of it. Through the influence of Cardinal Beaton, five persons were burned on the Castle Hill of Edinburgh, on the 1st of March, 1539, the king himself being present at the martyrdom. The trial of one of them, Dean Thomas Forrest, a canon regular of the Augustinian Monastery of St. Colme's Inch, and Vicar of Dollar, on the charge of having and using the New Testament in English, brings out that he had been in the habit of doing a novel thing; for though he was a dignitary, he preached out of the Scripture, and committed every day three chapters to memory. It was brought against him, not merely that he would not take the cow and corpse cloth, but that he taught his parishioners to say the Paternoster, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments in English, "which is contrary to our Acts, that they should know what they say." When, in vindication, he quoted the declaration of the apostle, that "he would rather speak five words with the understanding than ten thousand in an unknown tongue," he was challenged by his interrogators, "Where foundest thou that?" and his reply was, "In my book here in my sleeve." It was at once plucked from him, and his accuser, holding it up, shouted, "Behold, sirs, he has the book of heresy in his sleeve that has made all the din and play in our kirk." At this trial the Bishop of Dunkeld, who, eleven years before, had sat in judgment on Patrick Hamilton, merrily exclaimed, "I thank God that I never knew what the Old or New Testament was." In 1540, under the primacy of Beaton, Sir John Borthwick, a younger son of William third Lord Borthwick who fell at Flodden, was charged with having in his possession *Novum Testamentum in vulgari Anglico impressum*.² He escaped, however, but was burned in

¹ Despatch by Lord Howard, and God's Word as he had opportunity; Barlow. State Papers, vol. V, p. 48. "whereat, though the clergy shall repine, yet many of the lay people will gladly give hearing."
² He returned, however, in better would preach, with the king's license,

effigy at the market cross of St. Andrews, on the 28th day of May. David Straiton of Lauriston,¹ and Norman Gourlay a secular priest, were condemned by a Council held at the Abbey of Holyrood—the king presiding, clothed in scarlet as a Scottish judge; and were burned the next day at the Rood of Greenside near the northern top of the Calton Hill, that the inhabitants of Fife might see the fire, and be “stricken with terror.” Similar scenes followed in the West of Scotland. Two young men, one a Franciscan and the other a youth from England, suffered in Glasgow. George Buchanan, the prince of Latinists, who had enraged the ecclesiastics by his *Franciscanus* and his *Somnium*, made his escape from prison in St. Andrews. The Duke of Norfolk, writing from Berwick, on the 29th of March, informs Crumwell, “Daily cometh unto me some gentlemen and some clerks which do flee out of Scotland, as they say, for reading the Scriptures in English, saying that if they were taken they should be put to execution. I give them gentle words and some money.”²

After the melancholy death of the James V, on the 14th of December, 1542, the weak Earl of Arran became Protector. But two factions at once sprang up: the clerical one assembling at Perth sent among other stipulations to Edinburgh that the New Testament in the native tongue should not go abroad. The stipulations were refused, and when Parliament met at Edinburgh on the 12th of March, 1543, it was proposed, on the motion of Lord Maxwell, that “all the lieges in this realm may read the Scriptures in our native tongue.” The New Testament had been now about seventeen years in the country, and it was time that it should be unfettered. In one of these sudden turns of affairs so common in Scottish history, Cardinal Beaton was flung into prison on a charge of forging a will in the late king’s name. But Chancellor Dunbar Archbishop of Glasgow rising in his place dissented *simpliciter*, in his own name and in the name of the prelates of the realm that were present. He and his party wished the measure to be postponed till a provincial

times, and raising an action of “de-clarator,” he had his sentence reversed, and his estates restored.

¹ The Laird of Lauriston was the first of his social rank that suffered.

² State Papers (Henry VIII), V, 154.

council of all the clergy should discuss the question, “to advise and conclude thereupon, if the same be necessary to be had in the vulgar tongue, to be used among the Queen’s lieges or not,” and thereupon he “craved instruments.” The Bible was produced in this meeting of parliament, and its opponents yielded so far as to allow that it might be read if the translation were true. They were challenged to produce a fault, and they instanced the use of “love” instead of “charity”; but when asked what the difference between the terms was, they were dumb. The opposition was vain, and an Act was passed to the following effect: “It is statute and ordained that it shall be lawful to all our sovereign lady’s lieges to have the Holy Writ, both the New Testament and the Old, in the vulgar tongue—in the English or Scottish,¹ of a good and true translation, and that they shall incur no crimes for the having or reading of the same; provided always that no man dispute or hold opinions, under the pains contained in the Acts of Parliament.”² The Dean of Restalrig “long repugned,” and certain “old bosses along with him.” The commissioners of burghs and part of the nobility then demanded that it might be “permitted to every man to use the translation of the Old and New Testament which they had, till the prelates and kirkmen set forth a translation more correct. But all compromise was negatived; every man was made free to read “the Scriptures in his own or the English tongue,” and all Acts made to the contrary were abolished. No time was lost; proclamation was made at the Market Cross of Edinburgh, and letters were sent through the country, enjoining proclamation to be made in the more important towns, among which Glasgow, the episcopal seat of the prime opposer and protester, is not mentioned. The regent’s proclamation, 19th March, 1543, was in the following terms:—

“GUBERNATOR.

“CLERK OF REGISTER. It is our will and we charge you, that ye gar proclaim this day in the mercat cross of Edinburgh, the Acts made in our Sovereign lady’s Parliament, that should

¹ “Scottish” means here the Gaelic tongue.
VOL. I.

² Act. Parl., II, 415.

be proclaimed and given forth to her lieges; and in special, the Act made for having of the New Testament in vulgar tongue, with certain additions, and thereafter give forth the copies thereof authentic, as effeiris, to all them that will desire the samyn, and insert this our command and charge in the books of Parliament for your warrant. Subscrivit with our own hand at Edinburgh, the 19th day of March, the year of God 1543 years.

"JAMES G."¹

The general possession of the Book had nursed the desire to have the reading of it removed from the list of felonies. It is difficult to say what number of copies of the Scriptures was printed abroad, for so many of them bore the London imprint, and the eye of the initiated alone can recognize the differences. The English Parliament at this time was forbidding the Bible to all the industrial classes, who were not to read it on pain of a month's imprisonment. No mention was made of issuing any Bibles from the press in Scotland, or of any measures conducing to it, and none were printed there for more than thirty years afterwards. No one can doubt, therefore, that there had been a very large importation of Testaments, probably also of the editions of Coverdale, Matthew, and of the Great Bible. That the Bible was very common twenty-five years afterwards may be inferred from the words of John Knox. Describing the result of the Act which removed all restriction, he relates, with great glee, "This was no small victory of Christ. Jesus fighting against the conjured enemies of His verity: not small comfort to such as before were holden in such bondage, that they durst not have read the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, nor articles of their faith in the English tongue, but they should have been accused of heresy. Then might have been seen the Bible lying upon almost every gentleman's table. The New Testament was borne about in many men's hands. . . . Some would touch their familiars with it and say, 'Thou hast been under my bed-feet these ten years.'"²

¹ James Hamilton, second Earl of Arran.

² Works, vol. I, pp. 100, 101, Edinb., 1846.

But a crisis soon came; Arran recanted, Beaton was set at liberty, the work of murder again commenced, and many fled from suffering. Adam Wallace, who could read the Bible in three languages, was seized, and burned on the Castle Hill of Edinburgh. The mode of destroying heretics was somewhat changed. Four men, instead of being burned, were hanged at Perth, and a woman, the wife of one of the four sufferers, after giving the infant in her arms to a sympathizing neighbour, was drowned in the Tay. George Wishart, a younger son of the laird of Pitarrow Justice Clerk in 1513, had, when master of a school in Montrose, been guilty of the heinous crime of reading the Greek New Testament with his scholars. On being summoned to appear before Hepburn Bishop of Brechin, he fled, in 1538, into England. He is called, in the records of the city of Bristol, the "obstinate Scot"; and having preached in St. Nicholas Church some form of theological error, he was seized, sent to London, and tried and condemned by Cranmer—when he recanted and bore his faggot.¹ Returning to Scotland about 1544, he discoursed from his English New Testament, and was arrested, and burned on the 1st of March, 1546, at St. Andrews; the windows and battlements of the castle opposite the stake being fitted with silk hangings and cushions to enable the cardinal and his associates to enjoy the spectacle. The country was now kept in wretched turmoil by armed feuds and factions, and contending parties bent on supremacy put to hazard life and estates. Though the aristocracy of Scotland had been little better than a set of coronetted savages, yet change of religious opinion began first among them and the landed gentry; but the commons awoke to consciousness and "newness of life" with the dawn of the Reformation, for the truths of Scripture had not been lost upon them.

¹ Dr. M'Crie, from misreading one letter of a single word in the Bristol Record, gave currency to the story that Wishart recanted what he had preached against the papacy. But the heresy which he retracted is not very intelligible; it seems to have been a serious and unscriptural error regarding the merit of Christ as a Redeemer. Life of Knox, p. 481.

CHAPTER XXXI.

KING HENRY died on the morning of the 28th of January, 1547, and the accession of Edward VI gave immediate ascendancy to the Reforming party. According to common report the young monarch manifested great veneration for the Divine Word, and an English Bible is said to have been used at his coronation. When three swords were presented, the symbols of his being the royal head of three kingdoms, he told his courtiers that another sword was yet wanting, the Bible—"the sword" of the Spirit—which with the greatest reverence he commanded to be brought and carried before him. Sir Thomas More had alleged that if the Bible were in common use, it would be sometimes employed as a footstool; but the prince in his earlier years, "when proffered a boss-plate Bible to stand upon to heighten him, with holy indignation refused it."¹ The old incubus had now passed away, and the people breathed freely. The possession of the Bible was no longer restricted by statute; every one, whatever his social position, might have it and study it. It was free to all as the light and air of heaven. But the minds of the rulers in church and state were so occupied with the guidance of the changes passing over them that no new translation was undertaken during this reign of six years and a half. At the same time the instructions of Archbishop Cranmer to the two foreigners, Fagius and Bucer, during their stay with him at Lambeth prior to their installation as professors at Cambridge, would almost imply that the idea of a new translation was before his mind. His words are, "It had been a great while his pious and most earnest desire

¹ Heylin's Reformation, vol. I, p. 27, Cambridge, 1849.

that the Holy Bible should come abroad in the greatest exactness and true agreement with the original text," and they were therefore to devote themselves to the scientific exegesis both of the Old and New Testament.¹ Castalio ascribes a similar purpose to the young king.² Anderson states that the Scripture was simply "let alone" during Edward's reign. The fact is, however, that his father's last act against the English Bible was at once declared to be "utterly void and of none effect," and there was also an injunction issued "that parsons, vicars, and curates, were to provide, within three moneths next after this visitation, one book of the whole Bible of the largest volume; and within one twelve monethe next after the said visitation the paraphrasis of Erasmus also in English upon the Gospels, and the same set up in some convenient place within the said church that they have cure of, whereat their parishioners may most commodiously resort unto and read the same. . . . That every parson, vicar, curate, chambrey priest, and stipendiary being under the degree of a bachelor of divinity, should have of his own the New Testament both in Latin and English, with the paraphrase of Erasmus upon it; and that the bishops, &c., in their synods or visitations, should examine them how they had profited in the study of Holy Scripture . . . That in the time of high mass the epistle and gospel of that mass should be read in English; and that on every Sunday and holy-day the parsons, &c., should plainly and distinctly read one chapter of the New Testament in English at matins, and one chapter of the Old Testament at even-song, and that when the priest reads the Scripture to the parishioners, no manner of persons, without a just and urgent cause, should depart out of the church." Cranmer's Articles of Visitation were based on these injunctions.³ But the superstitious love of the Latin Bible and service lay deep in the popular mind, and the substitution of English provoked great opposition in various parts of the country. An insurrection broke out in Devonshire in 1549, and the rebels sent up fifteen demands, among them one that

¹ Strype's Cranmer, vol. II, p. 149.

³ Cardwell's Documentary Annals

² Dedication of his Latin Version. vol. I, p. 8, &c.

"they must have the mass in Latin celebrated by the priest alone, and that the sacrament should be worshipped as it was wont to be," that "they utterly refused the new English," though they confessed that "certain of us Cornish men understand no English"; and that "all books of Scripture should be called in again, as otherwise the clergy shall not of long time confound the heretics."¹ On the other side, and on the part of furious and sturdy Protestants, the English Bible and Prayer Book were idolized. When, toward the end of 1581, Campian, the Jesuit, kneeled on the cart at Tyburn, and began to use Latin prayers, some of the reckless spectators shouted to him to pray in English.²

About 1550 Sir John Cheke translated Matthew and a portion of Mark into a species of old English³—to the exclusion of all Latin and foreign terms—using moon'd for lunatics; tabler for money changer; toller for publican; toll-booth for the place of receipt of custom; frosent for apostle; ground-wrought for founded; byword for parable; crossed for crucified; freshman for proselyte; hunderder for centurion; and such phrases as "beggars be gospelled," Matt. xi, 5; "brood gardes and large welts," Matt. xxiii, 5. Such a style appears like a rebound on purpose from Gardyner's attempt to Latinize the English version, but it was English born out of due season. Cheke, the first regius professor of Greek at Cambridge, had been tutor to Prince Edward, and afterwards was Privy Councillor and Secretary of State. On Mary Tudor's accession, he went to the Continent, but was arrested there. At his trial he broke down, and he was forced to make a public recantation, which so filled him with shame that he died in 1557 of a broken heart, "carrying God's pardon and all good men's pity along with him."

In the reign of Edward numerous editions of former versions were published, amounting to thirty-five editions of the New Testament and thirteen of the whole Bible. Thirty-one out of

¹ Coke apologizes for writing his Commentaries on Littleton in English, and hopes that it will not "work any inconvenience."

² Froude, V, p. 167.

³ The version was edited from a MS. in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, by James Goodwin, B.D., London, 1843.

fifty-seven printers were engaged in printing and publishing the sacred volume. Each of them selected what edition he preferred himself or what he thought was most likely to be preferred by the public. According to the best accounts there were two issues of Coverdale in 1550 (Andro Hester), and a third issue in 1553 (R. Jugge). Of Cranmer's Bible there seem to have been seven issues, and of his Testament eight. Of Matthew's there were five; one of them being a joint enterprise, the Bible being printed by Nicholas Hyll for eight "honest menne"—publishers, each of these publishers having a title-page with his name for his own quantity of copies. Taverner's version was also issued in 1549, and there was apparently a reprint in 1551. This Bible was published in five volumes in 1549, 1550, and 1551—"printed in sundry partes for these pore, that they which ar not able to bie the whole may bie a part." An English translation of the new Testament accompanied the paraphrase of Erasmus in 1548, and there are said to have been two other editions, the translator of Erasmus being Nicholas Udall,¹ under the patronage of Queen Catherine Parr. Of the New Testament of Tyndale or Matthew there were twenty-four editions, and fifteen editions at least bear the name of Tyndale. An edition of the New Testament was issued at Worcester in 1550, and a New Testament of 1552-53, was by royal order to be sold for 22d., representing as many shillings of present value. Cranmer threw no patronage over his own version, nor did he in any jealousy discredit its rivals. Indeed, two impressions of Matthew's Bible, one in August and another in October, 1549, preceded the reprint of the Great Bible in December of the same year. In each year of this short reign there were eight issues of the Bible. Edition followed edition so quickly that the image of the Hebrew prophet was realized, "The plowman shall overtake the reapers, and the treader of grapes him that soweth

¹ Nicholas Udall was for a time at Doyster. The Princess Mary assisted the head of the Eton School, then Erasmus, and, as the preface states, rendered those on St. John. Udall was the author of the first English comedy, Ralph Royster was not molested during her reign.

seed"—such continuous and self-renewing abundance as if spring were blended with harvest, or harvest encircled with spring.

Cranmer has sometimes been condemned for his alleged complicity in the burning of Joan of Kent, whose error was a peculiar and misty inconsistency of opinion on the subject of the incarnation. The story is that the prelate pleaded earnestly with the reluctant boy-king to sign her death-warrant, and that Edward at length with many tears attached his signature, calling God to witness all the while that his spiritual adviser must bear the blame. But the fact is that Edward did not sign the fatal paper, and that the prelate's name is absent from the list of those who in Council pronounced the sentence of execution. The general belief at the period was that the judicial law of Moses was of perpetual authority. What has been called the "great crime" of Calvin was justified by Melancthon and Beza, and even the poor victim Servetus himself held that blasphemy was a crime worthy of capital punishment. John Knox and Peter Dens use the same analogy in proving death to be the due penalty of heresy. The First Book of Discipline affirming that heretics should die, for they are like those who falsify the "coine of a king," quotes in proof the edict of Darius, which "pronounced that a balk should be taken from the house of that man and he himself hanged upon it, that durst attempt to hinder the re-edifying of the temple." The Catholic casuist argues the same conclusion against heretics, as they resemble falsarii pecuniæ—forgers of the current coinage. Persons were put to death for religious aberrations in Elizabeth's reign, without any protests from great statesmen and divines; and when under James an incorrigible man was burned, Archbishop Abbot gratefully acquiesced in the deed, and Isaac Casaubon, then in England, cordially approved, though he had witnessed the deplorable results of persecution in his own country. Men have been slow to learn that conscience is the Holy of holies in the bosom of humanity the temple of God, and that no one has a right to enter into it but the Great High Priest alone.

Edward died on the 6th July, 1553, and was succeeded by

his elder sister Mary. Her reign forms one of the gloomiest periods of English history, and an epithet of terrible colour cleaves to her and to her Bishop of London. Reginald Pole (Rainold Pool), who had been so long a busy plotter on the Continent, came over to England, and he had such coadjutors as Gardyner, Bonner, and Tunstall, called by the queen "her own bishops," though they had advocated her father's repudiation of the Pope, but they had been maltreated under Edward. Tunstall's sermon against the papal jurisdiction had been published in 1539, and Gardyner's "*De Vera Obedientia*" was in wide circulation, with or without the alleged preface by Bonner.¹ Gardyner was, in fact, as much in favour of the divorce and of the royal supremacy as Cranmer, and in the tract referred to he affirms that the royal supremacy was the introduction of "no new thing"—but only a "clearer assertion and a more significant expression of it."² Bonner had vindicated Henry and his cause at Rome in a style so rough and defiant that his Holiness threatened at once to burn him, or boil him in a cauldron of molten lead. Gardyner, the ablest man of the whole party, became her Lord Chancellor; and in the record of her bestowment of the Great Seal, she is called supreme "head on earth of the English and Irish Church." He also performed the ceremony which belonged of right to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and crowned the queen. Mary was aware of Gardyner's subtlety; and when he opposed her marriage with her cousin Philip of Spain, she declared that she "would prove a match for all the cunning of the Chancellor." Gardyner was opposed to the reunion of England with the Pope, and wished the English Church to keep its independence, with Mary as its head; but her reported answer was, "Women, I have read in Scripture, are forbidden to speak in the Church. Is it then fitting that your Church should have a dumb head?" Forced by his position as a statesman and lawyer to be an ecclesiastic, Gardyner was a subtle diplomatist, a matchless intriguer, and a wary, watchful, and unscrupulous antagonist of the Reformers. King Henry, provoked and angered by his audacity and ambi-

¹ See Maitland's Essay on the Reformation, p. 345, &c.

² Browne's Fasciculus, Appendix, vol. II, p. 800.

tion, had left him out of his will; and his ally, the Duke of Norfolk, had the king lived a few hours longer, would have been executed. Lloyd, in his "State Worthies," says of Gardynier, though their epigrammatic form gives his words an air of exaggeration, "He never did what he aimed at, never aimed at what he intended, and never said what he thought, whereby he carried it so that others should do his business when they opposed it, and he should undermine theirs when he seemed to promote it; a man that was to be traced like the fox, and read like the Hebrew backward; if you would know what he did, you must observe what he did not." Sitting as judges, men like Gardynier and his compeers were sometimes twitted by the prisoners at their bar for again accepting the Pope, thus getting, as from Rogers, Bradford, Taylor, and Sandars, some "privy nips."

Heath, in succession Bishop of Rochester, and Worcester, and Archbishop of York, and co-editor with Tunstall of two issues of the Great Bible, had some scholarly reputation. When he was only Archdeacon of Stafford, he went along with Foxe, Bishop of Hereford, and Barnes, to Germany on an embassy; and Melancthon writes to Camerarius about him, "Only one of the guests, the Archdeacon Heath, excels in amiableness of disposition and sound learning." Cranmer also praises "his learning, wisdom, and discretion."¹ He succeeded Gardynier as Lord Chancellor in 1556, and during his rule two hundred and seventeen persons suffered martyrdom. The Primate of England had the unenviable honour of signing the death warrant of the Primate of all England, as Pole would not consent to be consecrated as long as Cranmer his predecessor lived. On his refusal to take the oaths under Elizabeth, Heath was imprisoned, letters of a treasonable nature being found in his house. Being released, he retired to Chobham, where he died in 1579.

The English Bible, even in effigy, could not now be endured. On the marriage of Mary to Philip, July, 1554, when the royal pair went in procession through the city of London, they passed the conduit in Gracechurch Street, which had been gaudily

¹ Todd's Life of Craumer, vol. I, p. 147.

adorned in honour of the festive occasion. Among other scenic pieces there was a tableau which represented the "nine worthies," of which Henry VIII was one; and the painter, having probably seen Holbein's frontispiece to the Great Bible, presented him with a sword in the one hand, and in the other the Verbum Dei—the Word of God or the English Bible, which he was delivering to his son Edward. The indiscreet artist was at once laid hold of and brought before Bishop Gardynier, the Chancellor, who, in angry tones, hurled at him the epithets of "villain" and "traitor," and peremptorily commanded him to efface the volume and put a glove in its stead. The terrified workman, on being so admonished, set to the task without delay, and fearing lest he should leave some part of the book in King Henry's hand, applied his brush so sweepingly that he "wiped away a portion of the fingers withal."

Not only the Bible as a whole, but any text or fragment of it, was also detested. Verses had been painted on the walls of many churches, but they were not to be tolerated. Bishop Bonner therefore, on the 25th of October, 1554, issued a mandate in these terms:—

"Edmund, by God's permission bishop of London—to all and every parsons, vicars, clerks, and lettered, within the parish of Hadham, or within the precinct of our diocese of London, wheresoever being—sendeth greeting, grace, and benediction.

"Because some children of iniquity, given up to carnal desires and novelties, have by many ways enterprised to banish the ancient manner and order of the church, and to bring in and establish sects and heresies; taking from thence the picture of Christ, and many things besides instituted and observed of ancient time laudably in the same; placing in the room thereof such things, as in such a place it behoved them not to do; and also have procured, as a stay to their heresies (as they thought), certain Scriptures wrongly applied to be painted upon the church-walls; all which persons tend chiefly to this end—that they might uphold the liberty of the flesh, and marriage of priests, and destroy, as much as lay in them, the reverent sacrament of the altar, and might extinguish and enervate holy-days, fasting-days, and other laudable discipline

of the catholic church; opening a window to all vices, and utterly closing up the way unto virtue: Wherefore we, being moved with a Christian zeal, judging that the premises are not to be longer suffered, do, for discharge of our duty, commit unto you jointly and severally, and by the tenor hereof do straitly charge and command you, that at the receipt hereof, with all speed convenient, you do warn, or cause to be warned, first, second, and third time, and peremptorily, all and singular churchwardens and parishioners whosoever, within our aforesaid diocese of London (wheresoever any such Scriptures or paintings have been attempted), that they abolish and extinguish such manner of Scriptures, so that by no means they be either read or seen; and therein to proceed, moreover, as they shall see good and laudable in this behalf. And if, after the said monition, the said churchwardens and parishioners shall be found remiss and negligent, or culpable, then you, jointly and severally, shall see the foresaid Scriptures to be razed, abolished, and extinguished forthwith."

Mary reigned only five years and four months, and the work of fire and blood began about a year and a half after she ascended the throne. The statement sanctioned by Lord Burghley is, that during three years and nine months almost the number of four hundred perished—men, women, maidens, and children—by imprisonment, torments, famine, and fire. A hundred thus perished annually. At Bow, thirteen persons were burned at once, eleven men and two women; ten in the same way at Lewes, including a mother and her son; and ten also at Colchester, six in the morning and four in the afternoon. Five months before the queen's decease, the last fire was kindled at Smithfield. Seven martyrs were consumed; but the scene was the triumph of the sufferers, and the sympathy of the spectators responding with a loud and hearty Amen to the martyrs' prayers, in spite of a heartless prohibition of all such demonstrations, alarmed the persecutors, and showed the fruitlessness of their cruelty. For force could not extirpate what argument was unable to overthrow. The song chanted in the Church of England celebrates "the noble army of martyrs," and she has "the witness within herself." During

such a reign the Bible could not but be neglected. By a proclamation of the 18th of August, 1553, the open reading of the Scriptures was prohibited. Many, however, clung to them. When Edward Underhill, "the hot Gospeller," was sent to Newgate, he asked especially "for his Bible and his lute." In March, 1555, William Hunter, a London apprentice, and not very regular in his attendance at mass, was, when reading his Bible in Brentwood Church, discovered by a priest who reprimanded him, and told him "it was never a merry world since the Bible came forth in English." The young man was seized, and sent up to Bonner, by whom he was condemned to die in his native village. There were no new issues of the sacred volume; for no one ventured to publish it, and the English Bible ceased to be used in public service. A second proclamation of 13th June, 1555, forbade the importation of the works of twenty-five authors, twelve of them English, such as Tyndale, Coverdale, Cranmer, Fryth, Latimer, Hooper, &c. A third, issued five months before the queen's decease, ordered wicked and seditious books to be given up without delay, on pain of death by martial law. But though there was no direct edict against the Scriptures by name, many copies must have been destroyed.¹ The churchwardens of a parish in Kent reported in 1565 that they "had no Bible since their church was defaced ten years before." The current report was that numerous Bibles chained to the desks in the churches were torn away and trampled on. When the bones of Fagius and Bucer were exhumed and thrown into the fire at Cambridge, in presence of Christopherson Bishop of Chichester, there was a repetition of this enormity; and Bibles with other books were destroyed when posthumous indignity was inflicted on the corpse of Peter Martyr's wife.

John Rogers, the editor of Matthew's Bible, was the first to die under Mary, and in the strange and gallant words of Bradford in reference to such a form of death, "he bravely brake the

"But in Paul's church may a Note on the margin of the first man see the leaves of the Bibles torn edition of Becon's New Year's Gift, out, and that no small number." Early Writings, p. 322, Parker Soc. ed.

ice."¹ Cranmer, whose name is imperishably associated with the English Bible, perished also at the stake. The incidents of his examination and martyrdom, when "out of weakness he was made strong," need not be written at length. Ridley, Hooper, Latimer, Taylor, Sandars, and Ferrars also served the truth by dying for it. Hooper, who was in the Fleet prison for eighteen months, had at first good accommodation, as he paid well; but, after he had been deprived, Gardyner ordered him to be shut up in a common cell, which had the sink of the prison on the one side, and the Fleet ditch on the other, and where he had "a wicked man and a wicked woman" for his fellows. John Rough,² a Scotchman, and Cuthbert Symson, were apprehended in December, 1557, as belonging to the "brethren" who assembled in secret for divine worship—one principal element of which was the reading of the English Scriptures. Bonner, after tearing the beard of the first, and racking the other three times in one day, sent them both to the flames. Other sufferers were caught as they were in meditation on God's holy Word. Some died in prison, while others escaped, and seven were burned on the 28th of June, 1558. The queen was a poor lonely, disappointed, and hysterical woman, labouring under mortal disease, wedded to a "man stone-hard, ice-cold"; but the Spanish blood in her veins occasionally showed itself, and in her unenlightened conscience she imagined that she was propitiating God, and securing health and domestic blessing, by offering human sacrifice, as if

"The blood and sweat of heretics at the stake
Were God's best dew upon the barren field."

Her mind was soured also by the execution of so many of her friends. Featherstone had been her schoolmaster, and Abel her mother's chaplain; and the Countess of Salisbury was a special favourite and a near kinswoman.

A few sentences may now be given to the life of Coverdale, after the publication of the Great Bible. He seems to have

¹ See page 348.

² It was Rough that had called John Knox to the ministry in St. Andrews. He had gone to Islington

some time before his own capture to see a martyrdom, in order, as he quaintly said, "to learn the way."

gone abroad after the fall of Crumwell, and on his return, at Henry's death, he was selected by the queen dowager to be her almoner. On the 30th of August, 1551, he was consecrated Bishop of Exeter, under King Edward, and he had enjoyed his bishopric only a brief period when Edward died. Mary succeeded, and Coverdale was summoned to her Council at Richmond, on the 22nd of August, and made a prisoner at large. In April of the following year, "he was about upon sureties." During an earlier residence on the Continent he had married Elizabeth Macheson, "a sober, chaste, and godly lady," of Scottish extraction, and his connection with this Scottish lass now saved his life, as Dr. Johannes Maccabæus Macalpinus, a learned Scotsman, had married her sister. Macalpine would have spurned, with Celtic pride, the thin and poor name of M'Bee, sometimes invented for him, as if it had been represented by Maccabæus. He was of the famous clan Alpine, to which Roderigh of the "Lady of the Lake" belonged. In 1532 he became prior of the old and opulent Dominican Monastery at Perth; but to escape a charge of heresy he fled to England in 1534, where he was kindly sheltered by Bishop Shaxton, of Salisbury, who gave him a stall in his cathedral. As late as 1550, in the accounts of the Lord Treasurer of Scotland, he is called simply John Makalpyne; and according to Stephanus, in his *Historia Danica*, the name Maccabeus was invented for him by Melanchthon, in allusion to the famous heroes of Hebrew history. When the *Senatus Academicus* of Wittemberg met to confer upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity, Martin Luther himself occupied the chair.¹ Macalpine had become chaplain to King Christian II of Denmark, and Professor of Theology at Copenhagen; and he had been one of the translators of the Danish Bible, published in 1550. Macalpine and Coverdale were "like brothers"; and the Danish king, influenced by his chaplain, wrote to Queen Mary on the 25th of April, 1554, asking the release of Coverdale as a great favour, for he felt assured that no crime

¹ Macalpine had at an earlier period studied at the University of Cologne, and prior to his leaving it had been admitted to the degree of Baccalarius Theologiæ Formatus. Gerdesius, *Historia*, vol. III, p. 417, describes him as sprung ex nobili et antiqua Macalpinorum in Scotia familia.

or disloyalty could be laid to his charge, and he trusted that the queen, "as well for her own character as for his earnest request, would set him at liberty." The letter was not attended to for some time, and the reply at length vouchsafed was a mere pretext, for it gave out that Coverdale had been dealt with simply as a debtor to the treasury, being in arrears with the tenths of his diocese, which he had held only for two years. The Danish monarch wrote a second time on the 24th of September, in stronger terms, saying that he was glad to hear that "debt" only was charged on Coverdale; that he therefore hoped his request would be the more readily complied with; and that he would be under profound obligation to her majesty if Coverdale should be permitted to appear before him, and assure him in person of his safety. Some months were still allowed to pass. At length, in February, 1555, the queen answered that a "greater weight was to be given to your request than our debt," and on the following day, a fortnight after the martyrdom of John Rogers, Coverdale got passports for himself and two servants, and set out at once for Denmark—"escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowlers." The queen's reluctance to part with Coverdale is manifest in the dilatory and hypocritical correspondence; and had not this powerful intercession for him come from a monarch whom she durst not offend, Coverdale, as one who had been so influential in the production of the English Bible, would most certainly have gone the way of Tyndale and Rogers, and left the world in a chariot of fire.

The first translator had met his death with firmness, and triumph and with a fervent and patriotic ejaculation on his lips; but his successor's escape from a similar death seems to be grudged by some biographers, because Tyndale, Rogers, and Cranmer fell victims. If, however, Coverdale escaped the fire, he lost the pre-eminence and came short of the highest glory. No power less than that of the Danish sovereign could have shielded him, for he had taken a decided step towards martyrdom. After the public disputation at Oxford, and the recorded resolution of Rogers, Hooper, Bradford, and the other ministers in confinement, "to suffer as

the will and pleasure of the higher powers shall adjudge," he cast in his lot with them, and wrote "the things above said, do I, Miles Coverdale, late of Exon, consult and agree with mine afflicted brethren, being prisoners—mine own hand." The "higher powers" were thus dared to their face, and Coverdale's formal accession and signature must have now given him a jeopardous notoriety. An incident, however, had taken place by which probably he was unconsciously favoured. Gardynier, on being accused at the trial of Rogers of instigating the queen to persecute heretics, had been so provoked as unguardedly to retort, "The queen went before me, and it was her own motion." The saying was at once "noised abroad," and her own popularity, as well as that of Philip, was at stake; but as if to neutralize the report, his Spanish chaplain and confessor, Alphonso di Castro, of all men in the world, preached on the 10th of February, and inculcated the doctrine of toleration in his sermon, condemning in severe terms the taking of human life for the sake of religion; for the Scripture taught bishops to instruct their flocks, and not to burn them if they erred. One result was that the burnings were stopped for about five weeks.¹ A week after this remarkable sermon, and as if to present an illustration of its doctrine and a proof of the integrity of the preacher, Bishop Coverdale, with her majesty's letter, was sent out of the country. There might be other circumstances, unknown to us, that may have induced the queen or her council to deny themselves the pleasure of putting him to death. At all events, there is no ground for Colonel Chester's remark, that "by his comparative insignificance he passed safely through the storm." The man who had been prominently connected with so many editions of the English Bible at the beginning of the struggle; who had, in this work which had so notoriously helped to evoke the religious revolution, been a client of Crumwell, and a welcome and trusted instrument under Cranmer; who had written decidedly and earnestly against the mass and prayers for the dead, and who had defended, with an ardour approaching to vehemence, the "Protestation" of the martyred Barnes; who had been a royal chaplain and a

¹ Strickland's *Lives of the Queens of England*, vol. II, p. 641.—Bohn's ed.
VOL. I. 2 E

married bishop; for whose advancement to the see of Exeter a catholic prelate, the queen's "governor" in her earlier years, had been thrust aside; whose works had been specified and named in royal proclamations; whose history had been marked by positions and filled with successes so provocative of popish alarm and vengeance, and whose recantation was so hopeless that no one thought of attempting either to menace or inveigle him into it;—such a man could not be a "nobody" in the reign of Mary and Philip, and under the administration of Gardynere, Bonner, and Pole.¹

Chancellor Gardynere, who had procured the re-enactment of the old and savage Act of Henry IV, *de Hæretico Comburendo*,² who would have sacrificed the Princess Elizabeth, and who had zealously inaugurated the present cruelties against which even Renard was forced to protest, soon retired from the sad work. He died on the 12th of November, 1555, but the persecution went on after his death, Bonner being a prime agent in his own diocese. In the previous reign Gardynere had himself been roughly treated, and kept for some years in close confinement, so that he returned to power with a soul exasperated to fierce retaliation. After Philip left his wife and England, Cardinal Pole became the queen's principal if not sole adviser, and the persecution not only did not abate, but was specially fierce in his own diocese—eighteen men and women being burned under the shadow of his own cathedral. In November, 1558, three men and two women were burned at Canterbury. They were personally presented by Pole for punishment; and they were the last that suffered in the persecution. Yet Pole was a man of blameless life, and very far from being cruel by nature. Though he held the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith, he was filled with the Romish horror of heresy; and his moderate successor, Archbishop Parker, does not hesitate to call him *carnifex et flagellum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*.

Coverdale came home at the accession of Queen Elizabeth, but he was not restored to his former diocese of Exeter, though he was chosen to take part in Parker's consecration.

¹ Life of Rogers, p. 46, London, 1861.

² See p. 85.

The question of the vestments had again turned up, and Coverdale, though at his own consecration at Croydon he was "habited" like the three prelates who set him apart, appeared at the Archbishop's in a "plain black gown," the other bishops wearing "surplices."¹ It is not known if Exeter were offered to him; but the Act of Uniformity was passed, and in spite of all his claims as the giver of the first full Bible to England, and the editor of the Great Bible or Authorized Version of the period, he was put aside, though, in consideration of his past services, his might have been made an exceptional case. Grindal, Bishop of London, thought of him for the see of Llandaff: "if any competency of living could be made of it, I would wish it to Father Coverdale, now lately recovered of the plague. Surely it is not well that he, *qui ante nos omnes fuit in Christo*, should be now in his age without stay of living." But surely he deserved some recognition of his former labours. He had, under Crumwell, made a visitation in 1539 at Newbury, in Berkshire, for the purpose of calling in popish books and detecting popish practices. At the insurrection in Devonshire, in 1551, he went down with Lord Russell to preach to the rebels and treat with them. The enterprise was not without danger, and "who hazarded his life with that old, honourable Earl of Bedford? Ye shall find that none of the clergy were hasty to take that service in hand but only old Father Coverdale."² There is a note in the Register Book of King Edward's Council, "anno 1550, 20 Julii," ordering 40 lb. to be given to Miles Coverdale, preacher, as a reward from the king. In 1550 he had been one of a judicial committee of bishops and divines, who, under Cranmer, had in charge the trial of Anabaptists and other sectaries; and he had been a member of a royal commission, appointed in 1551, to revise the ecclesiastical laws, a work to which no small labour was given. At Exeter, Bishop Coverdale was a "great keeper of hospitalitie, very sober in diet, godlie in life, frendly to the godlie, liberrall to

¹ He came to have very decided opinions about the vestments, as may be seen in a joint letter sent by him along with Humphrey and Sampson to Farell, Viret, and Beza, in July, 1566.

² Troubles at Frankfort, p. 196.

the poore, and courteous to all men," and he attended regularly in the House of Lords during the session of Parliament. He had been in great hardships and privations on the Continent, and he had taught, preached, and translated at Wesel and Bergzabern. Bale says of him during his exile, "*Nunc autem in Germania pauper ac peregrinus manet.*"¹ At length Bishop Grindal, in 1563, collated him to the living of St. Magnus, near London Bridge. The good old confessor was again so poor that he could not pay the queen the first-fruits, amounting to £60, 16s. 10d. His petition to the archbishop and the bishop, urging their interference for him with Her Majesty to have the debt remitted, is simple and touching in its allusion to his age and poverty. The see of Exeter was poor, and had been suddenly wrested from him, according to his own description, "I being compelled to resign. And how I never had pension, annuity, or stipend of it these ten years and upwards; how unable also I am to pay the first-fruits, or long to enjoy the said benefice, going upon my grave, as they say, and not like to live a year. . . . And as I am bold most humbly to crave your grace's help herein, so am I fully persuaded, God willing, to shew myself again as thankful, and in my vocation during my short time as fruitful as I can. 29 Jan., new-year. Myles Coverdale, quondam Exon." Writing to Cecil, on the same subject, he says: "That heretofore (he praised God for it) his honour had ever been his special help and succour in all his rightful suits: and that if now poor old Myles might be provided for, it would please him to obtain this for him; he should think this enough to be as good as a feast. And so beseeching him to take this his boldness in good part, he committed him and all his to the gracious protection of the Almighty. From London, 6 Feb. Myles Coverdale, quondam Exon." But his age and poverty did not bar all recognition of his claims. He had already become a Doctor of Divinity at Tübingen, and he was admitted

¹ Script. Illustr., p. 721. *Nunc* 1553, and retired to Basle, where he *autem*, that is, at the time of his lived till his return to England, in writing the volume quoted from. 1559. Bale escaped on Michaelmas day,

to a similar honour at Cambridge, *per gratiam*, in 1563; and he himself, by authority of the vice-chancellor of Cambridge, admitted Grindal to the same degree, in his palace at London, 15th April, 1564. Coverdale resigned his living in 1566, perhaps under the actual or threatened enforcement of conformity; but he continued to preach as often as he had opportunity. The people, according to Strype, "ran after father Coverdale"; but he would not have it known where he was to preach, "though many came to his house to ask where he was to officiate next Lord's day." He did not care for tumultuous meetings, lest he should give offence to the government; but he never forgot his former episcopal dignity, for though his signature during his exile is often Michael Anglus, or Miles Coverdalu, he usually signs himself, after his last return to England from an exile of three years and a half, "Myles Coverdale, quondam Exon." Latimer, on the other hand, was happy at being released from his bishopric, and rejoiced in calling himself a "quondam."

Coverdale died in February, 1569, at the great age of eighty-one, fourteen years to a day after his escape from Mary and her bishops, and was buried in St. Bartholomew's Church, behind the Exchange. His grave was in the chancel, and a "fair plated stone" on the ground bore an elegant Latin inscription. The stone was destroyed in the great fire, but the parishioners of St. Magnus erected a tablet to his memory in 1837. When the church of St. Bartholomew was taken down, in 1840, his remains were discovered, and reinterred in his old church of St. Magnus.

The character of Coverdale has been unduly depreciated by several authors. What his work was, what his merit was, has been briefly stated. Colonel Lemuel Chester, who exalts John Rogers, says of Coverdale that he was "an honest and well-meaning, but a very ordinary plodding sort of man, like whom there can be ten thousand found any day in London, with no remarkable ability for either good or evil."¹ But whatever his ability, Coverdale did his own work when none of the "ten thousand" thought of attempting it; and though his

¹ Life of Rogers, p. 46.

talent was certainly not transcendent, it qualified him to be the first to give a whole Bible to the English people, and to edit the Great Bible, which for so many years occupied a high place. He has the great honour of priority in this hallowed enterprise. John Rogers did not translate; he only put together a Bible out of Coverdale and Tyndale: but a nobler crown than that of a translator was set upon his head, for he sealed his testimony with his blood, and was the first at that critical period to suffer, and to show the dignity, honour, and tenderness of a Christian martyr. Christopher Anderson glorifies Tyndale, and for the best of reasons; but in his glorification of Tyndale, he does no small injustice to Coverdale, whom he persistently and on all occasions undervalues. Tyndale was certainly of a far higher style of manhood, decided, earnest, and noble in purpose and act, possessed of high scholarship, doing a primary work, and having his lasting monument in our present New Testament. But Coverdale's secondary work filling up a chasm was indeed a necessary and welcome supplement. The Psalms, as revised by him for the Great Bible, are read many times a year in the Church of England, and will not be readily displaced. Anderson has an ingenious and pleasant way of speaking of Tyndale's Bible, nay, he calls Rogers the editor of "Tyndale's Bible," though he knew that there was really no such book, for his reference is to Matthew's Bible of which at least a third belongs to Coverdale. He also sneers at him as attempting to "push" his version in the reign of Edward, though from the first he had laid emphasis on the benefit derived from the use of various translations. He did not wish to alter his version, but to present it as at "first issued"; but he wrongly retained such a word as "penance," while he quite knew the meaning of the term, and that "penance" is in no sense "satisfaction" for sin. He had not the compact rigidity of Tyndale, the "divine stoutness" of Latimer, nor the impulsive energy of Barnes. When he preached the funeral sermon for the queen dowager, he quietly, but emphatically, warned his audience that the "offerings" were not "to profit the dead," but were meant "for the poor only," and that the "lights about the

corpse" were in no sense superstitious symbols. He did not employ the coarse fulminations of Bale, nor indulge in such railing accusations as to stigmatize "the most holy sacrament" of the Papists as "Jack in the Box and Round Robin," "lest he should be an offence or stumbling-block to the weak brothers."¹ Bale himself is subdued into gentleness when he describes Coverdale's "friendly and open disposition and most gentle spirit. The Spirit of God, which in some was like a powerful wind overturning rocks and mountains, was in him even as a gentle breath of air, infusing vigour into irresolute and wavering minds."²

But the eulogy of one reformer needs not to be connected with the disparagement of another, for they were all servants of the same Master. Which of them could have been wanted? Which of their gifts and graces could have been spared? "The eye cannot say to the foot, I have no need of thee," for guidance and progress are correlative. The watering of Apollos was as indispensable to the divine "increase" as the planting of Paul. Forms of common service differ greatly in character and value, but each in its place is necessary. Paul dictated, Tertius wrote, and Phebe carried the epistle to the Church in Rome. Without any further minute or invidious adjudication of claim or position among those great and good fathers of an eventful and perilous time, we may say in a word that Coverdale was very high in honour "among the thirty," but "he attained not to the first three."

Reference is made in the previous paragraphs to Coverdale's poverty, both by himself and others. His work in the west of England, at the period of the rebellion, naturally led to his appointment to the see of Exeter. But the see had been scandalously impoverished by his predecessor Voysey, who was 103 years of age when he resigned in favour of Coverdale. Hoker says that "of xxii. lordships and mannors, which his predecessors had left vnto him, of a goodlie yeerelic reuenewe, he left but three, and them also leased out. And

¹ Works, vol. II, p. 426. Preface to a translation of Calvin's Treatise on the Lord's Supper, Parker Soc. ed. ² Memorials of Coverdale, p. 140.

where he found xiiii. houses well furnished, he left onelie one house bare, and without furniture, yet charged with sundrie fees and annuities; and by these meanes, this Bishoprike, which sometimes was counted one of the best, is now become in temporall lands, one of the meanest: and a place scarce left for the Bishop to laie and rest his hed in."¹ The bishopric had been estimated in 1534 to be of the clear annual value of £1,566, 14s. 7½d.; but it was now diminished to £500 a year only. The alienations that Voysey had made were connived at, in order to induce him to give up the bishopric quietly; and Coverdale, who had no other preferments, and was not in very good circumstances, had no objection to the see, merely because the income was reduced from what it formerly had been.

The following was the epitaph on Coverdale's tombstone:—

HIC TANDEM REQUIEMQUE
FERENS FINEMQ. LABORUM,
OSSA COVERDALIS
MORTUA TUMBUS HABET,
EXONLÆ QUI PRÆSUL
ERAT DIGNISSIMUS OLIM,
INSIGNIS VITÆ
VIR PROBITATE SUÆ.
OCTOGINTA ANNOS
GRANDÆVUS VIXIT, ET UNUM,
INDIGNUM PASSUS
SÆPIUS EXILIUM.
SIC DEMUM VARIIS
JACTATUM CASIBUS, ISTA
EXCEPIT GREMIO
TERRA BENIGNA SUO.

¹ Catal. Bps. Exon. Le Neve's Fasti, vol. I. p. 377.

END OF VOLUME I.

THE ENGLISH BIBLE:

*AN EXTERNAL AND CRITICAL HISTORY OF THE
VARIOUS ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS
OF SCRIPTURE,*

WITH REMARKS ON THE NEED OF
REVISING THE ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

JOHN EADIE, D.D., LL.D.,
PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS,
UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

London:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
1876.

All rights reserved.

BS455

.E2

v. 2

CONTENTS.

GENEVAN VERSION.

CHAPTER XXXII.

Marian Refugees—Geneva—Whittingham—His New Testament—Genevan Bible—Those Employed in the Revision—Dedication to Queen Elizabeth—To the Christian Reader—Causes of its Popularity—Breeches Bible, Page 3

CHAPTER XXXIII.

The Genevan a Revision of Tyndale collated with Great Bible—Collation showing this, and also Influence of Beza—A decided Advance on the Great Bible—Excerpts—Changes to the better in the Apocrypha, . . . 16

CHAPTER XXXIV.

Terms with Latin Signification—Felicitous Renderings—Antique Words and Senses—Old Spelling—Unwarrantable Supplementary Clauses—Marginal Notes—Calvinism of Notes—Excellence of Version, 23

CHAPTER XXXV.

Bodley's Patent for printing Genevan Bible—Not printed in England during Parker's Life-time—Tomson's Revision—Great Popularity—Vitality—Esme Stuart and Cobham, 32

VOL. II.

27754

CHAPTER XXXVI.

Genevan Bible in Scotland—"Common Band" of Protestant Nobles—Scottish Scholars who might have taken part in Biblical Revision—Publication of Genevan Version and First General Assembly of the Kirk—First Edition printed in Scotland—Measures for increasing its Circulation—English of the South intelligible to Scottish Population—Overture for Revision of Genevan Version, 39

CHAPTER XXXVII.

Genevan the favourite Volume in Scottish Families—Laud's Dislike to it—Attacks upon it by Howson and Martin—Priest Hamilton and his Attack 50

THE BISHOPS' BIBLE.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Early Part of Elizabeth's Reign beset with Difficulties—Agnes Prest and Joan Waste—Elizabeth's Regard for the Scriptures—Her Eagerness for Uniformity—Different Bibles in Circulation—Parker and the Proposal for another Revision—His Coadjutors—The Various Translators—Bible Finished and Presented to the Queen—Parker on Affectionate Terms with Fellow-Workers, 59

CHAPTER XXXIX.

Description of First Edition of Bishops' Bible—Parker's Preface—No Royal Confirmation—Rebellion of Northern Earls—Critical Remarks by Lawrence—New Testament Revised—Collation of Three Versions in Ezekiel and Matthew—Notes—Burleigh's Portrait—Price, 76

CHAPTER XL.

Specimens of Literal Translations—Supplements—More Stately than Precise—Want of Uniformity—The Great Bible superseded—Three Versions in Circulation—Martin's Attack and Fulke's Defence, 95

RHEIMS AND DOUAI VERSION.

CHAPTER XLI.

This Version taken from the Vulgate—Account of the Vulgate—The Church of Rome—Its Reluctance to give Vernacular Versions to the People—Catholic Refugees in Reign of Elizabeth—Seminary at Douai—New Testament Translated at Rheims—Martin and Allen—Preface to New Testament—Motives for Translating—Method of Translation—Close Adherence to Latin Text—Answers of Fulke and Cartwright—Reasons for Translating from Vulgate—Polemical Notes—Translated with the Greek Text before them—Latinized English—Good Renderings—Use of the Genevan and the Bishops'—Uniformity—Rheims New Testament appealed to by Mary, Queen of Scots, on the Evening before her Execution, . . 107

CHAPTER XLII.

Old Testament published at Douai—Described—Preface sets forth Impediments—Gives Reasons for Translating from Latin Text—For Strictness in Translating some Words—Obscure Renderings, especially in Psalter—Idiomatic Renderings—Romish Notes—Controversy between Fulke and Martin—Whitgift and Cartwright—Table of Protestant Errors—Second Edition—Changes in subsequent Versions—Challoner and Lingard—Theological Nomenclature, 137

AUTHORIZED VERSION.

CHAPTER XLIII.

King James—Strange Incidents of Infantine Years—His Character presents a species of Dualism—Belief in Kingly Supremacy—Early Knowledge of Scripture—Fondness for Theological Discussion—Intolerance—Changes of Opinion—Flatteries heaped upon him—The Millenary Petition—Hampton Court Conference—Dr. Reynolds—The King and the Genevan Notes—New Translation agreed to—Bancroft's Correspondence with regard to it—Profusion and Poverty of the King—The Board of Revisers—Short Notices—Rules laid down for the Revision—Revision not Translation—Their own Arguments for Revision—Their Commendation of Scripture Study—Completion of the Work—Published—Dedication to the King—The Clause, "Appointed to be read in Churches"—Galloway, the Royal Chaplain—Fuller's Eulogy of the New Bible, 159

CHAPTER XLIV.

Constant Use of Hebrew and Greek Originals—Hebrew Text—Greek Text—Stephens and Beza—Marginal Notes—No Historical Notes—Help from various Translations—Other Helps—Selden's Glimpse into their Method of Procedure—Alternative Renderings in Margin—Influence of Bishops'—Of Earlier Versions—Care in Choice of Words—Excellence of English Style—Hebrew Phrases—Ingenious Turns of Diction—The English specially Saxon—Terms occurring only once—License taken in Translating the Apocrypha—Simplicity, Clearness, and Harmony—Universality of Adaptation—The English of the Beginning of the Seventeenth Century, 208

CHAPTER XLV.

Different Fate of Words in Margin and in Text—Words and Phrases in Contents of Chapters which have wholly or nearly passed away—Obsolete Words in Text—Words changed in Meaning—Archaisms—Words which

have only their Latin Meaning—Peculiar Phrases and Syntax—Varying Forms—Old Use of "His"—Variations in Spelling—Various Peculiarities, 242

CHAPTER XLVI.

Hostility to their Version anticipated by Translators—Charges of Broughton, Gell, and Ward—"Witchcraft"—"God Save the King"—Ecclesiastical Predilection—Doctrinal Influence—Anti-Popish Leanings—How far Beza was followed, 264

CHAPTER XLVII.

Supplemental Words—Italics—Supplements often unnecessary—Sometimes unwarranted—Headings of Chapters made by Command—Some Particulars regarding, 280

CHAPTER XLVIII.

The Bakers and the Printing of Authorized Version—Bibliography—First Editions brought into Correspondence with the Bishops' and the Genevan—Specimens of Inaccuracy in Early Issues—Various Editions—Edition of Buck and Daniel—Kilburne on the Errors in Editions of Hill and Field—Field's Pearl Bible—Assembly's Annotations—Lightfoot on the Apocrypha—Editions of Blayney and Others—American Revised Edition—Punctuation and Paragraph Marks, 288

CHAPTER XLIX.

Scotland never had any Indigenous Translation—Content to receive its Bible from Abroad and especially from England—Authorized Version gradually made its way in Scotland—Editions Printed in that Country—Anderson's Patent—Numerous and Gross Blunders in Widow Anderson's Bibles—And in those of her Successors—James Watson's Bibles—Row's Proposals for Revision—Bible Monopoly in Scotland—The "Sweet Singers" and their Rejection of Authorized Version—Superstitious Use of the Bible—Misquotations—Number of Chapters, Verses, Words, and Letters in Bible—Wonderful and Suggestive History of English Bible. 311

REVISION OF NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER L.

The Bible at once Divine and Human—Hostility to Settlement of the Text—
 Labours of Origen, Jerome, and Robert Stephens—Walton and Owen—
 Bengel, Mill, and Bentley—Various Scholars on the Desirableness of
 Revision of Authorized Version—The Long Parliament and Bill for
 Revision—Changes in the Original Text call for Revision of the Version
 —Nature of a True Revision—Futility of Objections—No Ground for
 Alarm—Strange Specimens of Revision by Scarlett and Heinfetter—
 Other Examples of Revision—Works on Revision—Tischendorf and
 Tregelles. 337

CHAPTER LI.

Defects of Authorized Version—Ambiguities—Inexact Renderings—Clauses
 Liable to be Misunderstood—Misleading Punctuation—Difficult Idioms
 and Technical Words. 365

CHAPTER LII.

Want of Uniformity—Variation so far Allowable—Terms Characteristic
 of a Divine Revelation of Love to a Sinful World—Variations which
 are Unnecessary—Capricious—Prejudicial—Motives Inducing—"Parable,"
 "Love"—"Straightway" in Mark—Connection weakened by Variation—
 Example in St. Paul's Address at Athens—His Repeated Use of the Same
 Term not brought out—Other Examples of Variation. 383

CHAPTER LIII.

One English Term represents several Greek Words—Distinctions thereby
 Effaced—Several Examples—Crown, People, Godhead, True, Temple,
 Life—John xxi, 15-17—New Light—Clusters of Instances—Child,
 Beasts, Die and Dead, World, Will, Weep, Servant, Judge, Wash,
 Remission, Repent, Hell—Devil and Demon—Miracle, Sign, Wonder—
 Anacolouthon and Paronomasia. 416

CHAPTER LIV.

The Greek Article—Inconsistencies of Translators in dealing with—Before
 the Name Christ—Some Point or Specialty lost by its Omission—
 Wrongly Inserted—Overpressed. 437

CHAPTER LV.

The Greek Tenses—Aorist misrendered by Perfect—Perfect by Present—
 Perfect and Pluperfect—Epistle to Hebrews characterized by use of
 Perfect—Imperfect not correctly Rendered—Mark and the Use of the
 Present—Greek Verbs corresponding to "become" and "be" con-
 founded. 445

CHAPTER LVI.

Prepositions—Misrendering of *ἐν*—*ἐκ*—*ἐν*—*ἐκ* and *ἀπό*—*ὑπὲρ* and *περί*—*ἐν* and
πρός—The conjunctions *ὅπως* and *ὥστε*. 458

CHAPTER LVII.

Proper Names—Most Familiar Forms employed—Jehovah—Proper Names
 variously spelled—Official Names—Chaldee Names. 466

CHAPTER LVIII.

Topography and Productions of Palestine—The Land illustrates the Book—
 Terms belonging to Botany and Zoology misrendered—Specific Topo-
 graphical Terms—Measures, Weights, and Coins—Qualifications of a
 Translator—Hallam and Newman on the English of the Authorized
 Version—Brief Account of the Revision at present in progress. 472

INDEX, 485

ERRATA.

Page 39, line 9 from top, for "Bible," read "Bibles."
 " 171, headline, for "Millenary Position," read "Millenary Petition."
 " 328, line 8 from top, for "part of fat things," read "feast of fat things."
 " 342, line 6 from bottom, for "exposition," read "exposure."

THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

THE GENEVAN VERSION.

VOL. II.

A

"BEZA also, in his Epistle to the prince off condy and nobles of France hathe these wordes. Seinge then all theis controuersies muste be discussed by Goddes worde, I suppose that this thinge ought chiefly to be prouided for, that seinge all cānot haue the knowledge to vnderstand the worde off God in theis peculiar languages, the Hebrue and the greek (whiche were to be wished) that there shulde be some true and apte translation of the olde and newe testamēte made the whiche diuers haue already labored to bringe to passe, but yet no man hathe hitherto sufficiently performed it. For the olde translation (whose so euer it is) although it ought not to be condemned, yet is it founde bothe obscure vnperfect and superfluous and also false in many places, to speake nothinge off an infinite variete off the copies. The whiche texte therfore many lerned and godly men haue laboured to amende, but not with like successe. And yet howe necessary a thinge this is, who so euer shall reade those moste lerned wryters off the gretians, and shall compare their interpretations (whiche are manie times farr from the purpos) with the Hebrue veritie, he shall confesse it with great sorowe.

"And the same euill was not onely hurtefull amonge the latten writers, but also the ignorance off the greeke tonge wherwith many off them were troubled, whiles they did depend off the common translation, they oftymes seeke a knott in a rushe (according to the olde prouerbe) and fell into moste fowle errors.

"Here might I touche a thinge parhapp worthe the hearinge yff hope were off redresse, whiche is, that yff the lerned were but one halff so earnest, zelous, and carefull, to se that the holy Scriptures in this Realme might be faithfully translated and trulye corrected, as they are many tymes abowte matters nothinge so necessarie: I woulde not dowte to saie that they shulde do vnto god an excellent peece off seruice,

"For the moste parte off oure Englishe Bibles are so ill translated (as the lerned report) and so falsely printed (as the simple maie find) that suche had nede to be verie well acquainted with scripture, as in many places shulde get owte the true meaninge and sence."

Troubles begun at Frankfort.

CHAPTER XXXII.

AS the storm did not burst for some time after the accession of Mary Tudor, a crowd of persons, to the number of eight hundred, who saw the clouds gathering, made their immediate escape to the Continent, and found refuge at Embden, Wesel, Strasburg, Worms, Berne, Basle, Zürich, and Frankfort. Bishop Gardyner's character and antecedents were well known; and he told Renard, the Spanish Ambassador, with quiet complacency, that "a few messages asking some of them to visit him at his house had given them wings." Among the refugees were saintly and learned men—five bishops, five deans, fifty eminent divines, and also several persons of high social distinction—six knights, three ladies of title—one of them the Duchess of Norfolk, the queen's cousin. Many foreigners who had come to England in Edward's reign also fled away. Among them was the uncle of the King of Poland, the well known John a Lasco, who obtained liberty from the Queen to leave the country. Under Edward VI he had the pastoral charge of a congregation of foreigners that met in the church of the Austin Friars. Many states and free cities assisted the exiles, for the spirit of brother-love, rising above territorial barriers, was fresh, and unwearied in its manifestations.¹ Nationality was forgotten, and the sufferings of the poor strangers were pitied, and relieved with unstinted hand. They enjoyed rest and peaceful worship for a brief season; but what were significantly called the "Troubles" soon sprang up

¹ Grafton, the printer of the Great his "Chronicle," and Foxe was at Bible, was among the exiles, and he Basle, engaged on his "Acts and employed his leisure in composing Monuments."

at Frankfort. The question of clerical vestments and of church service vexed them—some of them being of freer opinions, and others more conservative; some being disposed to compromise, and others to hold fast by the Prayer Book of Edward VI. Knox was not hostile to read prayers in themselves, for he helped to compose a “Book of Common Order”;¹ but Cox, who had been tutor to the late king, was intolerant of all modification. The controversy might surely have been allowed to sleep among persons who were living by sufferance and charity in a foreign land, and certainly it was not one that necessitated an immediate solution in their circumstances. The thought of so many brethren being burned at home might have saddened them into mutual forbearance, and gratitude for their own escape might have absorbed many minor predilections. But both parties grew more decided and passionate, and at length “the contention was so sharp between them that they parted asunder one from the other,” and the non-conforming section removed to Geneva.

This fair city, at the outlet of Lake Leman, girt with the mighty mountains, was regarded as the citadel of Protestantism, and it held in it the fate of Europe. Religion was therefore a matter of life and death to its inhabitants, who having frequently and gallantly defended themselves against surrounding enemies, felt that in fighting for Geneva they were upholding the liberties of humanity; for they knew that the triumph of the Duke of Savoy would entail civil and ecclesiastical ruin, and yoke all southern lands to ultramontane despotism. Their theology, whatever may now be said of it, exercised a mighty influence in England, had an ennobling ascendancy in Scotland, and has been carried across the ocean to strengthen and sanc-

¹ Carefully reprinted at Edinburgh by Blackwood & Sons, 1868, under the editorship of the Rev. W. Sprott and the Rev. Thomas Leishman, M.A. One characteristic difference between it and the English Book is, that the former allows variations—“using after sermon this prayer following, or such like”; “either in the words following, or like in effect”; “the action thus ended, the people sing the 103rd Psalm, or some other of thanksgiving.” See also Lorimer’s “John Knox and the Church of England,” London, 1875.

tify another great republic. A collection was made in England, through the bishops, for the city of Geneva in 1582, and in 1603 the Archbishop of Canterbury issued, with the royal sanction, a proclamation to gather another gift.

But the “gospellers” were not idle in their picturesque retreat, and a revision of the New Testament was soon taken in hand. Such a work was in harmony with the literary and Biblical enterprises of that city of refuge under the shadow of the Alps; and Calvin, Beza, and their colleagues, shed a new lustre on its history. Olivetan, a relative of Calvin, had already translated and published a French Bible, and in the execution of the work Calvin had rendered him considerable assistance. An edition of the New Testament, which, however, is not a portion of the Genevan Bible proper, was published in 1557, on the 10th of June—one of the most terrible months in England, for between the 18th and 22nd days of that month twenty-seven martyrs yielded up their lives.

The editor of this New Testament was William Whittingham.¹ William Whittingham was born in 1524, in the parish of Lanchester, near Durham. He became a commoner of Brasenose, Oxford, about 1540, and five years afterwards a fellow of All Souls. According to Wood, he was, on account of his scholarship, chosen one of the senior students of Christ Church, Henry wishing to fill it with the most promising young men, as had also been the desire of Wolsey. Whittingham had returned home from twelve years’ foreign travel and sojourn a few weeks before King Edward’s death. But he again left his native land, and, with many others, arrived in Frankfort on the 27th of June, 1554. Having gone to Geneva toward the end of 1555, he married Catherine, the sister of John Calvin. Whittingham came back to England on the accession of Elizabeth, and was promoted in 1563 to the deanery of Durham, which he held for sixteen years. He had been for a period chief engineer and chaplain in the defence of Havre de Grace, the general in command being the Earl of Warwick

¹ Whittingham distinctly identifies himself as the editor. Discourse p. xciii, Petheram, London, 1846.

brother to the Earl of Leicester through whose influence he so speedily obtained promotion,¹ though he had not been episcopally ordained. He dealt roughly with some of the monuments in his cathedral; but his wife showed what blood was in her, when she took "the blessed banner of St. Cuthbert," which had once waved victorious on Flodden Edge, and "despitefully burned it in her fire, to the open contempt and disgrace of all sacred relics."²

The New Testament so speedily revised, and published anonymously, is the work of one man, for in the explanatory address to the reader, he speaks uniformly in the first person singular. His words are: "To these therefore which are of the flocke of Christ which knowe their Father's wil, and are affectioned to the trueth, I rendre a reason of my doing in few lines. First, as touching the perusing of the text, it was diligently reuised by the moste approued Greke examples, and conference of translations in other tonges as the learned may easily iudge, both by the faithful rendering of the sentence, and also by the proprietie of the wordes, and perspicuite of the phrase. Forthermore that the Reader might be by all meanes proffited, I haue deuided the text into verses and sections, according to the best editions in other langages, and also, as to this day the ancient Greke copies mencion, it was wont to be vsed. And because the Hebrew and Greke phrases, which are strange to rendre in other tongues, and also short, shulde not be to harde, I haue sometyme interpreted them without any whit diminishing the grace of the sense, as our langage doth vse them, and sometime haue put to that worde, which lacking made the sentence obscure, but haue set it in such letters as may easily be discerned from the common text. As concerning the Annotations, wherunto these letters *a*, *b*, *c*, &c., leade vs, I haue endeouored so to proffit all therby, that both the learned and others might be holpen: for to my knol-

¹ See a short Life of Whittingham in Lorimer's "John Knox and the Church of England," taken from the papers of Anthony à Wood, Appendix, p. 303. ² Whittingham contributed several Psalms to the collection that went by the name of Sternhold and Hopkins.

lage I haue omitted nothing vnexpounded, wherby he that is any thing exercised in the Scriptures of God, might iustly complayn of hardenes: and also in respect of them that haue more proffited in the same, I haue explicat all such places by the best learned interpreters, as ether were falsely expounded by some, or els absurdely applyed by others: so that by this meanes both they which haue not abilitie to by the Commentaries vpon the New Testament, and they also which haue not opportunitie and leasure to reade them be cause of their prolixitie may vse this book in steade therof; and some tyme wher the place is not greatly harde, I haue noted with this mark ", that which may serve to the edification of the Reader: adding also such commone places, as may cause him better to take hede to the doctrine. Moreouer, the diuerse readings according to diuerse Greke copies, which stand but in one worde, may be known by this note ", and if the bookes do alter in the sentence then it is noted with this starre * as the cotations are. Last of all remayne the arguments aswel they which conteyne the summe of euery chapter as the other which are placed before the bookes and epistles: wherof the commoditie is so great, that they may serue in stede of a Commentarie to the Reader." There was also prefixed a stirring and eloquent Epistle, declaring that "Christ is the end of the lawe," by John Calvin.

Many erroneous statements have been made about this New Testament, such as, that it was edited or prepared by a company of the exiles—the theory of Lewis, Newcome, and of Todd who is in utter uncertainty on the matter, and like many others, does not distinguish the New Testament of 1557 from that published along with the Old Testament in 1560. Some even have held that this New Testament was the first edition of that reprinted in the Genevan Bible three years afterwards. Lewis and Newcome in their respective histories, D'Oyly and Mant in their preface, C. Rogers,¹ Dean Hook,² and others,

¹ Collation of the principal English translations of the sacred Scriptures, of some verses of the older translations in parallel columns. p. 40; by Charles Rogers, Dundee, 1847. This book is in no true sense ² Lives of the Archbishops of

have fallen into this error. But this New Testament is quite distinct from that of 1560—is, in fact, a different version.¹ The Genevan exiles regarded the New Testament of their Bible as their own completed and standard work, and never reprinted Whittingham's earlier publication. In fact, the New Testament was published before the translation of the Bible was commenced, being finished at press on the 10th of June, 1557. The Bible was begun by January of the following year, and it occupied the exiles "for the space of two years and more, day and night."

The New Testament was in small octavo or duodecimo—

"The Newe Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, conferred diligently with the Greke and best approved translations. With the arguments as well before the Chapters, as for every Boke and Epistle, also diuersities of readings, and moste profitable annotations of all harde places: wherunto is added a copious Table. At Geneva, printed by Conrad Badius, M.D.LVII;" the same words forming the colophon, with the addition, "this x day of June."

There is a peculiar engraving on the title-page, representing Time, with wings, scythe, and hour glass, helping Truth out of the grave, with this motto on its two sides—"God by Tyme restoreth Truth and maketh her victorious." The greater portion of the marginal notes of this New Testament were transferred to that of 1560. Thus, in the first nine chapters of Matthew, out of one hundred and thirty-four notes, there are only twenty not taken from this earlier New Testament. For the first time the chapters of the New Testament were divided into verses, with the number prefixed to each; and indeed they had been already marked on the margin of Stephen's Greek Testament of 1551, his fourth edition, printed at Geneva.² Supplemented words were

Canterbury, vol. IV, new series, p. 320. It is a thankless task to correct inaccuracies, but if any one will only collate a single chapter, such as the third chapter of Matthew, he will see that in it alone the translation of 1560 differs in twenty-nine places from that of 1557.

¹ A separate New Testament, published in 1560, is a reprint of that in the Bible of the same date.

² Robert Stephens introduced the

printed in italics, or in letters that might be easily distinguished from the common text, in imitation of Münster's Old Testament of 1534. There were also clear pointed marginal notes that in those days were greedily welcomed, especially such of them as were charged with theology.

This New Testament had been brought over to England before the death of Queen Mary; for we find that when John Living, who had been a priest at Auburn, and was under hiding in London, was informed against, brought before Bonner's chancellor, and carried to the jailor's house in Pater-noster Row, he complained of being robbed there of "my purse, my girdle, my psalter, and a New Testament of Geneva."

The Genevan exiles, having resolved to revise the English Bible, braced themselves for their work, and took hold of the best helps in their power. Their revision shows their method of procedure, and what versions, Latin, German, and French, they chiefly followed. A goodly number of scholars has sometimes been named as engaged in the enterprise—Le Long, Wood,¹ Todd, Newcome, Townley,² and Boothroyd,³ mention John Bodleigh, Miles Coverdale, Thomas Cole, Anthony Gilby, Christopher Goodman, John Knox, John Pullain, Thomas Sampson, and William Whittingham. But all those nine could not have given themselves to the labour, or continued at it till it was concluded. Coverdale was at Geneva only for a brief period after the version had been commenced; for on the 12th November, 1559, he was preaching in his turn at Paul's Cross, and Cole, Pullain, and Bodleigh came home during the same year. Knox went to Geneva in 1554, and left it in November for Frankfort. He returned to Geneva in 1555,

numbering of the verses in his edition of 1551, as one means of facilitating the preparation of a concordance which he had planned, and Henry Stephens had printed verse numbers in his *Psalterium Quincuplex*, 1509. Versus was the Latin form of the Greek "stichoi," there being, according to Dr. Scrivener, about five stichoi to two verses. Plain Introduction, p. 65,

2nd ed., Cambridge, 1874. Rabbi Nathan had set an example in his Hebrew Bible. The verses in the Latin translation of Pagninus are, in the New Testament, short paragraphs.

¹ Athenæ, 2nd ed., p. 194.

² Biblical Literature, vol. II, p. 286.

³ Introduction, p. 21.

and in the winter of that year came over to Scotland. Going back once more to Geneva for a brief period, he bade a final farewell to it in January, 1559.¹ Goodman, accompanied by Knox's wife and children, arrived in Edinburgh on the 20th September, 1559. The accession of Elizabeth in November, 1558, left it open for the exiles to come home, after they heard the good news, in the following month. When intelligence came that the persecutor had died—in their own phrase, that “the Lord had showed mercy unto England by the removal of Queen Mary by deathe, and placing the queen's majesty that now is, in the seate,” the work of revision was not nearly finished, but Whittingham, Gilby, and Sampson remained to carry it through. Thus Wood says, “Whittingham with one or two more did tarry at Geneva a year and a half after Queen Elizabeth came to the crown, being resolved to go through with the work.”² The author of the “History of the Troubles”³ records that “the congregation (after that they had rendred their humble thanks to the magistrates for their great goodnes towards them) prepared themselves to depart sauinge certeine whiche remained behinde the reste, to witt, to finishe the bible, and the psalmes bothe in meeter and prose, whiche were already begon, at the charges off suche as were off most habilitie in that congregation. And with what successe those workes were finished (especially the Bible) I must leaue it to the Iudgementes off the godly lerned, who shulde best Iudge off the same.” But it would seem from the language of their preface that others beyond those three gave assistance and counsel. The writer just quoted proceeds, “There is nothinge more requisite to attaine the right and absolute knowledge off the doctrine of saluation, wherby to resist all herisie and falshod, then to haue the texte off the Scriptures faithfully and truly translated, the consideration wheroff moued them with

¹ John Knox had two sons born to him during his residence in Geneva. At the baptism of the first, Whittingham was godfather; and at the baptism of the second, Bishop Miles Coverdale was godfather.

² Annals, vol. I, p. 151.

³ Whittingham was very probably the author. Goodman was first Protestant Professor of Divinity at St. Andrews.

one assent to requeste 2 off their brethern, to witt, Caluin and Beza, efsonnes to peruse the same notwithstandinge their former trauells.”

Gilby on his return became rector of Ashby-de-la-Zouch, the gift of the Earl of Huntington. He wrote a Commentary on Micah and some others of the Minor Prophets. Sampson, who is said by Wood to have been the means of converting Bradford the martyr, was offered the see of Norwich which he declined; and in 1561 he became Dean of Christ's Church, Oxford, but was removed in 1564, on account of his refusing to wear the vestments. In September, 1570, he was collated to the prebend of St. Pancras in St. Paul's—the stall of Ridley and Rogers in former days. Sampson was noted as a very able man. In a recommendation to the queen on his behalf it is said “that it is doubtful whether he is a greater linguist, or a more complete scholar and profound divine.” Native scholars were also engaged on the actual work, for they seized the “great opportunity and occasion which God presented unto us in this church by reason of so many godly and learned men, and such diversities of translations in divers tongues.” They were urged by many “who put them on this work by their earnest desire and exhortation,” and they were told “not to spare any charge for the furtherance of such a benefit and favour of God towards his church.” The Bible was finished and published in April, 1560, with the following title:—

“The Bible and Holy Scriptures conteyned in the Olde and Newe Testament, translated according to the Ebrue and Greeke, and conferred with the best translations in divers language. With most profitable annotations upon all the hard places, and other things of great import, as may appear in the epistle to the reader. At Geneva, printed by Rouland Hall, MDLX.¹ The Newe Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ conferred diligently with the Greke and best approved translations in divers languages, &c.”

¹ The printer was himself a refugee from England, and after his return many books issued from his press, among others, in 1560 the Scottish Confession of Faith.

The woodcut in both titles is the passage of the Hebrews through the Red Sea—the motto above and below being Exodus xiii, 13, divided, and that on the sides similarly halved is Ps. xxxiv, 19. There are several “pictures” and maps interspersed through the volume. The Apocrypha has few marginal notes.

The Bible was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth in simple and vigorous language, without adulation or the cant of loyalty, and it thus addresses her Majesty: “The eyes of all that fear God in all places behold your countries, as an example to all that believe, and the prayers of all the godly at all times are directed to God for the preservation of your majesty. For, considering God’s wonderful mercies towards you at all seasons, who hath pulled you out of the mouth of lions, and how that from your youth you have been brought up in the Holy Scriptures, the hope of all men is so increased that they cannot but look that God should bring to pass some wonderful work by your grace to the universal comfort of his Church. This Lord of Lords and King of Kings who hath ever defended his, strengthen, comfort, and preserve your majesty, that you may be able to build up the ruins of God’s house to His glory, the discharge of your conscience, and to the comfort of all them that love the coming of Christ Jesus our Lord. . . .” Yet these men, exiles themselves suffering from Popish persecution, tell the queen to unsheath the sword against the Papists, and “utterly to abolish idolatry; to root out, cut down, these weeds and impediments. . . . in imitation of the noble Josias who destroyed not only their idols and appurtenances, but also burnt the priests’ bones upon their altars, and put to death the false prophets and sorcerers . . . yea, and in the days of King Asa, it was enacted that whosoever would not seek the Lord God of Israel should be slain, whether he were small or great, man or woman.” Then followed an epistle: “To our beloved in the Lord, the brethren of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Now, for as much as this thing (progress in a holy life) is chiefly attained by the knowledge and practising of the Word of God (which is the light to our paths, the key of the kingdom of heaven, our comfort in affliction, our shield and

sword against Satan, the school of all wisdom, the glass wherein we behold God’s face, the testimony of his favour and the only food and nourishment of our souls), we thought we could bestow our labours and study in nothing which could be more acceptable to God, and comfortable to his Church, than in the translating of the Scriptures into our native tongue; the which thing, albeit that others heretofore have endeavoured to achieve; yet, considering the infancy of those times, and imperfect knowledge of the tongues, in respect of this ripe age and clear light which God hath now revealed, the translations required greatly to be perused and reformed.”

“To the Christian Reader,” they describe their work: “Now as we haue chiefly obserued the sense, & laboured always to restore it to all integritie: so haue we most reuerently kept the proprietie of the words, considering that the Apostle who spake & wrote to the Gentiles in the Greeke tongue, rather constrained them to the liuely phrase of the Ebrewe, then enterprised farre by mollifying their language to speake as the Gentiles did. And for this & other causes we haue in many places reserued the Ebrew phrases, notwithstanding that they may seeme somewhat hard in their eares that are not well practised, & also delight in the sweet sounding phrases of the Holy Scriptures. Yet lest either the simple should be discouraged, or the malicious haue any occasion of iust cauillation, seeing some translations reade after one sort, & some after another, whereas all may serue to good purpose & edification, we haue in the margent noted that diuersitie of speech or reading which may also seeme agreeable to the minde of the Holy Ghost, & proper for our language with this marke ||. Againe, whereas the Ebrewe speech seemed hardly to agree with ours, we haue noted it in the margent after this sort ‡, vsing that which was more intelligible. And albeit that many of the Ebrew names be altered from the old text, & restored to the true writing & first originall, whereof they haue their signification yet in the vsuall names, little is changed for feare of troubling the simple readers. Moreouer, whereas the necessitie of the sentence required any thing to be added (for such is the grace & proprietie of the Ebrewe & Greeke tongues that it cannot but either by

circumlocution or by adding the verbe or some word, be vnderstood of them that are not well practised therein) wee haue put it in the text with another kinde of letter, that it may easily bee discerned from the common letter. As touching the diuision of the verses, we haue folowed the Ebrew examples which haue so euen from the beginning distinguished them. Which thing as it is most profitable for memorie, so doth it agree with the best translations, & is most easie to finde out both by the best Concordances, & also by the quotations which we haue diligently herein perused & set forth by this *. Besides this, the principall matters are noted and distinguished by this marke ¶. Yea, & the arguments both for the booke & for the chapters with the number of the verse are added, that by all means the reader might be holpen. For the which cause also we haue set ouer the head of every page some notable worde or sentence which may greatly further as well for memorie as for the chiefe point of the page. And considering how hard a thing it is to understand the Holy Scriptures, & what errors, sects, & heresies grow dayly for lacke of the true knowledge thereof, & how many are discouraged (as they portend) because they cannot attaine to the true & simple meaning of the same, we haue also indeuoured both by the diligent reading of the best commentaries, & also by the conference with the godly & learned brethren, to gather briefe annotations vpon all the hard places, as well for the vnderstanding of such words as are obscure, & for the declaration of the text, as for the application of the same, as may most appertaine to God's glory, & the edification of his Church. Finally, that nothing might lacke which might be bought by labours, for the increase of knowledge & furtherance of God's glory, there are adioyned two most profitable tables, the one seruing for the interpretation of the Ebrew names: & the other containing all the chiefe & principal matters of the whole Bible: so that nothing (as we trust) that any could iustly desire is omitted."

Many things about this edition gave it immediate, wide, and lasting popularity. It was printed in Roman characters, with division into chapters and verses, as in the previous New Testament. It was not a heavy, unhandy folio like the editions

of Coverdale, Rogers, or the Great Bible; but a moderate and manageable quarto. Its marginal notes were a kind of running comment—vigorous and lucid, dogmatic and practical, presenting such aspects of truth and duty as were then all but universally prized, and such political lessons as the History of England so naturally shaped and suggested. It became at once the people's Book in England and Scotland, and it held its place not only during the time of the Bishops' Bible, but even against the present Authorized Version for at least thirty years. It was the first Bible ever printed in Scotland (1576-79), and it was the cherished volume in all Covenanting and Puritan households. And it was entitled to this pre-eminence as a learned and cautious revision.

The Genevan version is often called the "Breeches Bible," from its rendering of Gen. iii, 7—"They sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves breeches." The translation "breeches" is not, however, peculiar to the Genevan, for it is the translation of "perizomata" in both the Wycliffite versions. The term occurs afterwards in the "Golden Legende"—that is, portions of the historical books of Scripture, translated and printed by Caxton, 1503—"And thenne they toke fygge levys, & sewed them togyder for to cover their membres in the manner of breches."¹

¹ Mr. Blunt says, "Some editions in tall and unwieldy folio, printed of the Geneva Bible are called the by Basket, Oxford, 1717. The error Vinegar Bible, from a misprint of occurs in the running title at Luke vinegar for vineyard." But the so-called Vinegar Bible is only an instead of "parable of the vine- edition of the Authorized Version, yard."

CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE Genevan New Testament of 1557 is a revision of Tyndale's version collated with the Great Bible. The work was carefully done, but without due leisure. The influence of Beza is perceptible, his Latin version having been published in 1556. It usually follows Tyndale in the basis of the version or in form and phrase, and Tyndale is also the foundation of the New Testament of the Great Bible. It often agrees with him against the Great Bible. Thus, in the first chapter of Galatians:—

GALATIANS I.

Verse.

10. "Preach I now man's doctrine or God's?" after Tyndale—the Great Bible having, "Do I now persuade men or God?"—"speak unto men," ed. 1539. The Genevan, after Tyndale, omits the "hitherto" of the Great Bible.
19. The Great Bible has, "Other of the apostles saw I none"; the Genevan, following Tyndale, has "no nother of the apostles sawe I."
23. The Great Bible has, "They glorified God in me," the correct rendering; but the Genevan "for me" is based on Tyndale's "on my behalfe."

In the same chapter the Genevan follows the Great Bible in the following places as against Tyndale:—

4. "according to the will of God"; Tyndale, "thorow the will of God."
9. "as we sayde before"; Tyndale, "as I saidde before."
12. "but by the revelation of Jesus Christe"; Tyndale, "but received it by."

Though the translation follows Tyndale generally as against the Great Bible, it sometimes differs from both, and is often led by Beza. Thus again, Galatians, chap. i:—

Verse

2. "unto the churches in Galatia"¹; "congregations" being the rendering in Tyndale and in the Great Bible.
13. "the Church of God,"² Tyndale and the Great Bible having "congregation," as in verse 2. The word "church," which has given rise to so much dispute about its meaning, rights, and powers, was thus brought in by the puritan revisers, and was naturally preserved both in the Bishops' and in the Authorized Version.
- "extremely"³; Tyndale and Great Bible, "beyond measure."
14. "traditions received of my father"⁴—Tyndale and Great Bible, "traditions of the elders."
16. "to reveal his Son to me"⁵; Tyndale and the Great Bible, "for to declare his Son by me."
20. No initial particle in Tyndale and the Great Bible—the "now" of the Genevan (1560) perhaps representing *autem*, Beza.
22. "They heard only *some say* that he"⁶; Tyndale and the Great Bible, "they heard only that he."

The same chapter in the Bible of 1560 has other changes, making it yet a better and a more literal translation—many of the changes being suggested by Beza.

Verse

1. "which hath raysted him from the dead"⁷; Tyndale, the Great Bible, and Genevan, 1557, "raysted hym from death."
4. "which gave him selfe for oure sinnes, that he might deliver us"⁸; Tyndale and Genevan of 1557 having, "to deliver us."
6. "so soon . . . from him that had called you," Genevan, 1560; "forsaking him that had called you," Genevan, 1557.
9. "let him be accursed"⁹; Tyndale, "hold him accursed."

¹ Beza, *Ecclesiis*.² Beza, *ecclesiam Dei*.³ Beza, *summe*.⁴ Beza, *patribus meis acceperam*.⁵ But Beza has, "in me."

VOL. II.

⁶ Beza, *Sed solum audierant qui dicerent*.⁷ Beza, *ex mortuis*.⁸ Beza, *ut eximeret nos*.⁹ Beza, *anathema sit*.

GALATIANS I—*Continued.*

Verse

11. "not after man"¹; Tyndale, Great Bible, and the Genevan of 1557, "not after the manner of man."
 16. "I communicated not"²; Tyndale, Great Bible, and Genevan, 1557, "I commened not of the matter."
 17. "turned againe vnto Damascus"³; Tyndale, Great Bible, and Genevan, 1557, "Came agayne to Damascus," an improvement on Beza, though not a correct translation.

In verses 6 and 15 the pluperfect is wrongly used in both Genevan versions, "had called you," "had separated me"; Tyndale and the Great Bible being more literal.

Tyndale, as we have seen, is very careless about the connecting particles, and usually omits them as γάρ in verse 10, δέ in verse 11, γάρ in verse 12, δέ in verses 19 and 20; the Great Bible follows Tyndale in all these places but verse 12; the Genevan of 1557 does not translate the small words in verses 11 and 20, but that of 1560 translates the particles in all these instances, and its translations are preserved in the Authorized Version. This rendering of the particles is a characteristic improvement on Tyndale.

The Genevan Old Testament is a decided advance on the Great Bible, as two excerpts, one from the historical books and the other from the prophets, may show. Though the version is brought nearer to the Hebrew, it does not suffer in its English style. Sampson was reputed to be a good Hebrew scholar, and guidance was found in Pagninus, Münster, and Leo Judæ.⁴

¹ Beza, *secundum hominem*.

² Beza, *non contuli*.

³ Beza, *ac denuo reversus sum Damascus*.

⁴ The reference is to the Latin version of Leo Judæ, which is sometimes called the Tigurine Bible—Tigurum being a Latin name of Zürich; Turicum is said, however, to

be the real name. Leo Judæ dying before the work was concluded, it was finished by Bibliander (Buchmann), Cholin, and Gualter, and published in folio at Zürich in 1543, Pellicanus being editor. Froshover's arms, the tree and the frogs—a punning use of his own name—adorn the title-page.

GREAT BIBLE.

GENEVAN.

NUMBERS XX.

Verse

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1. And the children of Israell came with the <i>whole multitude</i>¹ vnto the deserte of Sin, in the fyrst moneth, & the people abode at Cades; and <i>there</i> dyed Mir Iam, & was buryed there.²</p> <p>2. But there was no water for the <i>multitude</i>,⁴ & they <i>gathered</i>⁵ <i>themselves</i> together againste Moyses & Aaron.⁶</p> <p>3. And the people chode with Moyses and spake, saying: woulde God that we hadde perished, when our brethren dyed⁹ before the Lord.</p> <p>4. Why have ye broughte the congregation of the Lorde into this wyldernes: that bothe we & oure cattell should dye <i>in it</i>?¹¹</p> <p>5. Wherefore have ye <i>made us to go out of Egypt</i>, to bring us into this <i>ungracious</i>¹³ place, which is no place of seede, nor of fygges, nor vines, nor of pomegranates, neither is there any water to drynke.</p> | <p>Then the children of Israel came with the <i>whole congregacion</i>³ to the desert of Ziu in the first moneth, & the people abode at Kadesh, where Miriam dyed & was buryed there.</p> <p>But there was no water for the <i>congregacion</i>,⁷ & they assembled themselves <i>against</i> Moses and & <i>against</i> Aaron.⁸</p> <p>And the people chode with Moses & spake saying. Woulde God we had perished when our brethren <i>dyed</i>¹⁰ before ye Lord.</p> <p>Why have ye broght the congregacion of the Lord unto this wil-derness that both we & our cattel shulde dye <i>there</i>?¹²</p> <p>Wherefore <i>now have ye made us to come up</i>¹⁴ from Egypt, to bring us into this miserable place, which is no place of sede, nor figs, nor vines, nor pomgranates? neither is there anie water to drinke.</p> |
|--|---|

¹ Cum universa multitudine, Münster.

² "Ibi," repeated in Pagninus and in Coverdale, after Luther and the "daselbst" of the Zürich.

³ Omnis congregatio, Pagninus. "The children of Israel even the whole congregation," of the Authorized being according to the Hebrew. Universus scilicet cœtus, Leo Judæ.

⁴ Multitudini, Münster.

⁵ Preserved in the Bishops' and Authorized.

⁶ Second "against" of the Hebrew not repeated in Coverdale and the Zürich Bible.

⁷ Congregationi, Pagninus.

⁸ Contra . . . contra; adversus . . . adversus, Pagninus, Leo Judæ, & according to the Hebrew.

⁹ The same verb is repeated in Tyndale (Matthew), Pagninus, and Leo Judæ, after the Hebrew; so in Luther and the Zürich version, and in Coverdale.

¹⁰ In morte fratrum nostrorum, Münster.

¹¹ In eo, Münster.

¹² Ibi, Pagninus.

¹³ Tyndale (Matthew).

¹⁴ Fecistis ascendere, Vulgate; ef-fecistis ut ascenderemus, Leo Judæ.

GREAT BIBLE.

GENEVAN.

NUMBERS XX—Continued.

Verse

6. And Moyses and Aaron went from the congregation unto the doore of the tabernacle of *wyt-nesse*,¹ & fell upon theyr faces [& they² cryed unto the Lorde & saide: O Lorde God, heare the crye of this people, & open them thy tresure, even a fountayne of lyving water that they maye bee satysfied, & that theyr murmuring maye cease] & the glory of the Lorde appeared upon them.

7. And the Lord spake unto Moyses, saying,

8. Take the rodde, and gather thou & thy brother Aaron the congregation together, & speake unto the rocke before theyr eyes & it shall give forthe hys water. And thou shalt brynge them water out of the rocke, to give the *company*⁴ drinke & theyr *beastes*⁵ also.

9. And Moyses took the rodde from⁷ before the Lorde, as he commanded hym.

10. And Moyses & Aaron gathered the congregation together before the rocke: & Moyses⁹ sayde unto

Then Moses and Aaron went from the assemblie unto the dore of the Tabernacle of the *congregation*³ & fel upon their faces: & the glorie of the Lord appeared unto them.

And the Lord spake unto Moses saying—

Take the rod, & gather thou & thy brother Aaron the congregation together, & speake ye unto the rocke before their eies, & it shall give forthe his water, & thou shalt bring them water out of the rocke: *so thou shalt give*⁶ the congregation & their *beastes* drinke.

Then Moses toke the rod from before the Lord, as he *had commanded* him.⁸

And Moses & Aaron gathered y^o congregation together before the rocke & Moses sayd unto them

⁵ Tyndale (Matthew).

⁶ Ut potum praestes coetui, et iumentis eorum, Münster.

⁷ Authorized goes back to Tyndale, "from before the Lord."

⁸ Sicut praeceperat, Vulgate; jusserrat, Münster.

⁹ A supplemented nominative to the singular verb, "he said," Tyndale.

¹ Septuagint, *μαρτυριον*; Vulgate, foederis; similarly Münster, Luther, and the Zürich, taking the word from a root similar to the true one.

² An interpolation from the Vulgate.

³ Ecclesiae, Pagninus, and according to the Hebrew.

⁴ Tyndale (Matthew)

GREAT BIBLE.

GENEVAN.

NUMBERS XX—Continued.

Verse

them: heare *ye rebels*¹ you, must¹ we *fette*² you water out of the rocke.

11. And Moyses lift up hys hande, & with hys rodde he smote the rocke *two times*,⁴ & the water came out abundantly, & the *multitude*⁵ dranke & theyr *beastes* also.

—Heare now, ye rebels: shal³ we bring you water out of this rock.

Then Moses lift up his hand & with his rod he smote the rock twice, & the water came out abundantly: *so the*⁶ congregation & their *beastes* dranke.

MALACHI III

1. For *march*⁷ the daye commeth that shall burne as an oven: & all the proude, yea, & all such as do wyckednesse, shall be *strawe*⁸ & the daye that is *for to come*,⁹ shall burne theym up (saieth the Lorde of hostes, *so that*¹⁰ it shall leave them nether rote nor braunche.

2. But unto you that feare my name shall that Sonne of ryghteousnesse aryse, and health shall be under hys wynges: ye shal go forth & *multiplie*¹⁴ as the fat calves.¹⁵

For *beholde*¹¹ the day cometh that shal burne as an oven, & all the proude yea & all that do wickedly, shall be *stubble*,¹² & the day that cometh¹³ shal burne them up saith the Lord of hostes & shall leave them neither roote nor branche.

But unto you that feare my name shal the Sunne of righteousness arise, & health shal be under his wings, and ye shal go forthe, & *growe*¹⁶ up as fat calves.

¹ Must, Tyndale (Matthew).

² Fette, fetch, kept in the Authorized Version.

³ Coverdale, Werden wir . . . bringen, Zürich and Luther.

⁴ Duabus vicibus, Pagninus.

⁵ Multitudo, Münster.

⁶ Ita ut, Vulgate.

⁷ Coverdale.

⁸ Strouw, Zürich.

⁹ Dies venturus, Pagninus.

¹⁰ Coverdale, Adeo ut, Leo Judæ.

¹¹ Ecce enim, Pagninus; quoniam ecce, Münster.

¹² Stipula, Pagninus and Vulgate.

¹³ Dies veniens, Vulgate.

¹⁴ Multiplicabimini, Pagninus.

¹⁵ Maskälber, Luther.

¹⁶ Pinguescetis. But the meaning is, "shall leap in wanton joy." The verb describes the prancing of horses in Hab. i, 8.

"And," in last clause, omitted in Luther and the Zürich, and after them by Coverdale.

GREAT BIBLE.

GENEVAN.

MALACHI III—Continued.

Verse

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>3. Ye shal treade downe the ungodly, for they shalbe lyke the <i>ashes</i>¹ under the soles of youre fete in the day² that I shal make, sayeth the Lorde of hoostes.</p> <p>4. Remembre the lawe of Moses my servaunt whych I <i>commytted</i>³ unto him in Horeb for all Israel wyth the statutes & ordinaunces.⁶</p> <p>5. Behold I wyll send you Elias the prophet: before the commynge of the daye of the greates⁹ & fearful Lorde.</p> <p>6. He shal turne the hertes of the fathers to <i>theyr</i>¹¹ children and the hertes of the chyldren to their fathers, that I come not¹² & smyte the earth with cursinge.</p> | <p>And ye shal treade downe the wicked, for they shal be <i>dust</i>³ under the soles of youre fete in the day that I shal⁴ do this saith the Lord of hostes.</p> <p>Remember the lawe of Moses my servant, which I <i>commanded</i>⁷ unto him in Horeb for all Israel with the <i>statutes and judgments</i>.⁸</p> <p>Beholde I will send you Eliáh the prophet before the comming of the <i>great and feareful</i>¹⁰ day of the Lord.</p> <p>And¹³ he shal turne the heart of the fathers to the children, & the hearte of the children to their fathers, lest¹⁴ I come & smite the earth with cursing.</p> |
|--|--|

Several changes to the better were made in the Apocrypha. The earlier translations rested on the Latin text, but in the Genevan the Greek was rendered, as may be seen in the three first chapters of Tobit, where the third person of the narrative is changed into the first. The Prayer of Manasses, admitted by Rogers and kept in the Great Bible, is excluded. The Genevan translators of these books had a favourite guide in Beza.

¹ Cinis, Vulgate.² Tages den ich machen will, Luther.³ Pulvis, Münster.⁴ Die quo ego agam, Leo Judæ.⁵ Befohlen, Zürich and Coverdale.⁶ Bruch und recht, Zürich.⁷ Demandavi, Münster.⁸ Præcepta et judicia, Vulgate; statuta et judicia, Pagninus.⁹ Coverdale after the Zürich.¹⁰ Vulgate, Luther, and the Latin versions.¹¹ Coverdale.¹² Dass ich nicht komme, Luther.¹³ Et, Vulgate and Latin Versions, "and" omitted in Coverdale after Zürich.¹⁴ Ne forte veniam, Vulgate, Pagninus and Münster.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

THOUGH the English style of the Genevan version is so terse and idiomatic, there are occasionally terms with a Latin signification.

Thus, Psalm lxxvi, 4, "more bright and puissant than"; cxxxvi, 23, "our base estate"; "base" in the simple sense of low; cxlij, 7, "when thou art beneficial unto me"—doest good unto me.

Mark v, 12, "and incontinently Jesus gave them leave"—immediately or straightway; viii, 31, "the son of man . . . shulde be reprovèd of the elders"—reprovèd in the Latin sense, *i.e.* rejected; xii, 42, "two mites which make a quadrin"—a farthing or a fourth part; xv, 26, "the title of his cause was written"—the process of law against him, the legal meaning of "cause" being still preserved.

Acts xx, 24, "But I passe not at all;" in our version, "none of these things move me"; xxv, 18, "they brought no crime of such things as I supposed"—"crime" for "accusation"; crimen in its legal meaning yet seen in the verb to criminate.

Rom. xiv, 16, "cause not your commoditie to be evil spoken"—your well-doing, your beneficence to others.

2 Cor. iv, 9, "he hath sparsed abroad"—the compound dispersed being now used instead of the simple verb.

1 Thess. iv, 15, "prevent," the earlier versions having "shall not come ere."

James v, 17, "subject to like passions."

1 John iii, 14, "translated from death unto life."

The Genevan introduced "pastour," in Eph. iv, 11, and in

some sections of Jeremiah, instead of "shepherds," the Latin term not occurring in the older versions, and perhaps suggested by the "pasteur" of the French translation. To the Genevan we are indebted for "synagogues," Ps. lxxiv, 8, where the term signifies the building; "houses of God" being the phrase in the Great Bible. In Luke xii, 29, Tyndale, after the Vulgate and Luther, had given the more literal rendering of the verb, "neither clyme up on hye," and it is kept in Coverdale and the Great Bible, and is vindicated also by Meyer; but the Genevan version gave the better sense, that of 1557 having "neither let your myndes wander about these speculations," and that of 1560 having "neither stand in doute," after Beza. The Genevan version gave the correct rendering in Acts xxvii, 9, "because also the feast was now passed," with an instructive note on the Hebrew Kalendar—the earlier versions having "because also that we had overlong fasted"; and in the same chapter, 13, "loosed nearer and sailed by Candie"; the Vulgate had regarded "Asson" as a proper name, and it was followed by Luther; while Erasmus took it as the accusative of direction. The Genevan often preserves the article, as in the series of clauses James ii, 14-24. There is also a very literal rendering, Acts x, 15, "the things that God hath purified, pollute thou not."

The Genevan gave our Authorized Version many felicitous renderings—in separate terms, and in the position of words. It brought in "sacrilege," Rom. ii, 22; and was followed by the Rheims, but not by the first edition of the Bishops'. Whitgift made what he reckoned a good point out of this Genevan translation. In his letter to the queen, written probably when he was Bishop of Worcester, when he is upholding the inviolable nature of church lands, and showing the sin and danger of laymen setting profane hands on them, he affirms "that there is such a sin as sacrilege, for if there were not it would not have had a name in Holy Writ, especially in the New Testament."

There are many old Saxon forms and words in the Genevan translation, as "hurly-burly" in the marginal note, Acts xxii, 23.

There are such strong modes of the preterite as "stale" for stole, 2 Kings xi, 2; "swomme," Acts xxvii, 42; "wanne," past of win, 1 Maccabees i, 20; "holpe" for helped, xviii, 27—he holpe them much; "tabernacle which the Lord pight"—pitched, Heb. viii, 2; "stroke himself with stones," Mark v, 5; and such terms as "giltieship came on all men," Rom. v, 18, in 1557, but in 1560, "the faute came on all men."

Many antique words and senses are used, as "garde," for girdle, Exod. xxviii, 8; "backe," for bat, Lev. xi, 19; "profit," in the sense of thrive—"the child Samuel profited and grewe," 1 Sam. ii, 26; "frailes of raisins," a basket, 2¹ Sam. xxv, 18; "disdain," in the sense of to be angry with; "want," in the sense of is wanting—"if he be lost and want," 1 Kings xx, 39; "plant"—"with the plant of my feet," 2 Kings xix, 24; "trade," meaning path, or what is trodden; "train up a child in the trade of his way," Prov. xxii, 6;¹ "chapmen," for merchants, Isaiah xxiii, 8, "whose chapmen are the noblest of the world"; "clout," Ezek. xvi, 4, "swadled in cloutes," used in the Great Bible, and adopted by the Bishops'; "term," in the sense of end, Ezek. xxii, 4; "Avoide, Satan, be gone," Matt. iv, 10; "scrippe," for bag or wallet, Matt. x, 10; "ought," as the past of owe, Matt. xviii, 28—"which ought him an hundred pence"; to "disease," to trouble, Mark v, 35; "cratche"—"and laid him in a cratche," Luke ii, 7, manger, rack, or crib, used often in old English (la saint crèche, holy manger); the word occurs also in Wycliffe²; "creepie," for cripple, Acts iii, 2; "fardels"—"trussed up our fardels," Acts xxi, 15—"made up our baggage," the verb occurring also in the note to Acts ix, 14, "make up thy bed," or "truss up thy couche"; "grieces," for steps—gressus, a grise or step, Acts xxi, 35; "pill"—2 Cor. xii, 17, "did I pill you?"—plunder you; "endeavoured myself with that which is before," Philip. iii, 13; "fulfil," fill to the full—"My God shall fulfil all

¹ Foxe, vol. viii, p. 12, speaks of in the gap and trade of more prefer-
Cranmer's "behaviour and trade of ments."

life toward God and toward the ² Other examples may be found in
world," and the phrase occurs in a useful little volume—"English
Shakespeare's Henry VIII, "stands Retraced," &c., Cambridge, 1865.

your necessities," Philip. iv, 19; "to fulfil their sins always," 1 Thess. ii, 16—fill up their sins to the full measure; "enforced," in the sense of endeavoured—"enforced the more to see your faces," 1 Thess. ii, 17; similarly in the Bishops', Rom. xv, 20, "I enforced myself"; "improve," in the sense of reprove or convince—"improve, rebuke, exhort," 2 Tim. iv, 2; "harberous," for hospitable, Titus i, 8.

There are also many old spellings, as brast, for burst; fet, for fetch; grenne, for gin; glain, for glean; rouse, for room; charet, for chariot; carkess, for carcase; sowre, for sour; banket, for banquet; kowe, for cow; moe, for more; somer, for summer; perfite, for perfect; renoume, for renown; slouthful, for slothful; gheste, for guest; then, for than; physition; but it did not take "surgione" in Exodus xv, 26 from Coverdale and Matthew. We have yere, yeere, yeer, and year; eie and eye; anie and any; thei and they; twise and twice; mise and mice.

The genitive formed by -s does not seem to be used at all. The word is simply spelled—as "brothers eye." Yet there are some terms of modern aspect. Ezra vi, 1, "librarie"; Job ix, 33, "umpire," the word still found in the margin of the Authorized Version; 2 Chron. xiv, "regency"—"Asa deposed Maachah his mother from her regencie" (*margin*). The prayer "learn me true understanding and knowledge," Psalm cxix, 66, in the Great Bible, becomes in the Genevan "teach me," also in Psalm xxv, 8. Such forms as moe, fet, and charet are found in the Authorized Version of 1611. The Genevan version sometimes does more than translate—it occasionally ventures to interpret, as in James i, 17, "shadowing by turning"; ii, 6, "oppress you by tyrannie"; 16, warm yourselves, fill your bellies"; v, 11, "what end the Lord made."

Though the Genevan version be so decided an improvement on the Great Bible, it has not wholly escaped some of the faults of that edition—for, like it, it brings in unwarrantable and supplementary clauses, not into the text indeed, but into the "margent," and prints them in italics, especially in the Acts of the Apostles. These supplements in the margin are preceded by this mark ||: Acts x, 6, || he shall speake words unto thee whereby thou shalt be saved and all thine house—taken from

xi, 14; xi, 17, "who was I that I could let God?" || Not to give them the Holy Ghost; xiv, 7, "and there was preaching the gospel," || insomuch that all the people were moved at the doctrine; so both Paul and Barnabas remained at Lystra; 10, "said with a loud voice," || I say to thee in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. These additions are suggested by Beza, in his notes, and by his references to some Greek codices and to the Complutensian Polyglott. One is taken directly from the text of the Great Bible. xiv, 18, "scarce refrained they the people that they had not sacrificed unto them," || but that they should go every man home, and while they tarried and taught, &c., again suggested by Beza's note referring to four MSS. and Bede; 19, "which when they had persuaded the people," || and disputing boldly persuaded the people to forsake them, for, said they, they say nothing true, but lie in all things—suggested also by Beza's note, the reading being found in some minuscules. xv, 29, "and from fornication," || and whatsoever ye would not that men should do unto you, do not to others—Beza's reference being to the Complutensian and his own MS. D. 34, "Silas thought good to abide there still," || and only Judas went—from the Great Bible and the Vulgate, and commended by Beza. But the whole 34th verse is suspicious, and the argument against its genuineness preponderates. 37, "And Barnabas," || would take John—after the better Greek reading^{xy}; 35, "and when it was day, the governors," || the governors assembled together in the market, and remembering the earthquake that was, they feared and sent—found in Beza's note after MS. D.; xix, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus," || from five o'clock unto ten—referred to by Beza; ~~xxx~~, 23, "bonds and afflictions abide me," || in Jerusalem—Beza's Latin version after D. But the Genevan translators follow their guide into positive error—error coined in support of coveted harmony with the other gospels—when they put into their text, Mark xvi, 2, "when the sunne was yet rising," and give in their margin "not risen," Beza having a lengthy note on the subject, and intimating that "not" may have been dropped by accident.

The famous "marginal notes" are very numerous, and no

little time and pains must have been spent in the composition of them, for many of them are original, while others are selected from Calvin and Beza. We believe, with George Joye, that a translation of Scripture is better without them, and, with Tyn-dale, that a "bare text," without commentary, is sufficient to make men "wise unto salvation"; and the text is all that God gave for this blessed purpose. But if notes are admissible, many of the Genevan notes are to be praised for their fitness and honesty. They have been often depreciated and condemned on account of their theology. That theology was, however, the favourite creed of the time, and a mere fraction of the notes is decidedly Calvinistic. The notes on Acts are chiefly historical, geographical, and inferential, as suggested by the narrative. Such notes might be expected especially in the margin of the Epistle to the Romans; but while there are over two hundred and fifty notes, not more than ten of them are unmistakable Calvinistic utterances.

The longer notes on the sixth chapter of Romans are as follows, there being nothing very distinctive about them:—

Verse

2. He dyeth to sinne in whome the strength of sinne is broken by the vertue of Christ, and so now liveth to God.
3. Which is, that growing together with him, we might receiue vertue to kill sinne, and raise vp our new man.
5. The Greke worde meaneth, that we growe vp together with Christ, as we se mosse, yvie, misteltowe, or suche like growe vp by a tre, and are nourished with the juice thereof.
- „ If we by his vertue dye to sinne.
6. The flesh whercin sinne sticketh fast.
7. Because that being dead we can not sinne.
11. We may gather that we are dead to sinne, when sinne beginneth to dye in us: which is by the participation of Christ's death, by whome also being quickened we liue to God, that is to righteousness.
12. The minde first ministreth euil motiues whereby man's will is enticed: thence burst forth the lustes, by them the bodie is prouoked, and the bodie by his actions doeth sollicite the minde: therefore we commandeth at the least that we rule our bodies.

Verse

16. Shewing that none can be just which doeth not obey God.
18. It is a most vile thing for him that is deliuered from the slauerie of sinne to returne again to the same.
19. Leauing to speake to heavenlie things, according to your capacitie, I vse these similitudes of seruitude and fredome, that ye might the better vnderstand.
23. Sinne is compared to a tyrant which reigneth by force, who giueth death as an allowance to them that were preferred by the Lawe.

But the following note has a supralapsarian flavour about it, Rom. ix, 19:—

"As the onelie wil and purpose of God is the chief cause of election and reprobacion: so his fre mercie in Christ is an inferior cause of saluacion and the hardening of the heart, an inferior cause of damnacion." And even this note is given nearly word for word in the Bishops' with a change indicative of yet higher doctrine—for it says, "and the withdrawing of his mercy is the cause of damnation."

But their Calvinism now and then shows itself in a cowardly version, as in the note to the last clause of 1 Cor. ix, 27—"lest I myself should be reproved." "Reproved" might be allowed, for it then often meant rejected, but the note explains it as "reproved of men." Their theology bribed them to shrink from the plain meaning of final rejection. The Bishops' keeps the note, even though it gives the strong rendering, "lest I mee self shoulde be a cast away." Sometimes in textual difficulties the knot is cut, when it could not be loosed, as at Acts vii, 16—the note is, "It is probable that some writer through negligence put in Abraham in this place instead of Jacob, who bought this field, or by Abraham he meaneth the posterity of Abraham." The word Apocrypha stands alone on the top of the right hand page in the Apocryphal books, which are not thought worthy of being honoured by any distinctive headings.¹ The page in Mark that contains the story of the

¹ Other notes will be referred to in the account of the Hampton Court Conference.

daughter of Herodias has for its heading, "The inconvenience of dancing."

Referring to the Genevan version, and to "show the *animus* of the men," Cardwell selects the note to Rev. ix, 3, but he does not quote it fairly or fully. It says, "Locusts are false teachers, heretics, and worldly subtle prelates, with monks, friars, cardinals, &c."; but he leaves out the words "false teachers" in the first clause, and suppresses the conclusion, "which forsake Christ to maintain false doctrine."¹ What is remarkable, and not to be overlooked, these notes were so highly prized by the revisers, whose labours were meant to produce a rival Bible, that they adopted many of them into the margin of their new Bishops' Bible. Thus, in the Epistle to the Galatians, the marginal notes in the Bishops', with the exception of two alternative renderings, are every one of them taken from the Genevan; and the rendering in the Genevan text of the clause "which things are an allegory" becomes the note in the Bishops'.

The Anglo-Genevan Bible is much more correct than any of its predecessors, and ranks in value next to that in common use. It was also the great intermediate step between it and Tyndale's; both were made in exile; and, indeed, Coverdale's of 1535, and Matthew's of 1537 were likewise produced abroad. It was the self-imposed work of noble-hearted Englishmen, and they could not have spent their enforced leisure to better purpose. Their good scholarship and idiomatic English are alike apparent in many felicitous renderings which yet survive. Beza was their oracle, and he well merited the honour, for he was a masterly Hellenist, of great accomplishments and of refined tastes. His exegetical insight was clear and profound, unless when it was dimmed by the oblique lights of his theology. The English style of this version, made before the birth of Shakespeare, is clear, crisp, and vigorous—the honest and hearty speech of men who felt that their mother tongue needed not to be helped with elaborate combinations, nor studded with foreign terms, for its power lay in its simplicity, and its grandeur in its more familiar idioms. Beza's first

¹ Documentary Annals, vol. II, p. 12.

Greek New Testament did not appear till 1565; but they had Stephens' famous folio of 1550, and his fourth edition, published in the city of their adoption in 1551, and distinguished by the division of verses. These editions of Stephen were based upon the fourth edition of Erasmus (1527), which differs from his third chiefly in ninety changes or emendations introduced into the Apocalypse from the Complutensian Polyglott. The Genevan translators had, in this way, as good a text as could be supplied to them at the time. Various editions of the Hebrew Bible have been already referred to.¹

¹ See vol. I, p. 209.

27754

CHAPTER XXXV.

THE cost of the first edition had been defrayed by the English congregation at Geneva, among whom was John Bodleigh, or Bodley, father of Sir Thomas Bodley, who founded the great library at Oxford that bears his name. John Bodley, on his return to England, received from the Queen a patent giving him the sole right, "and his assigns, for seven years, to print, or cause to be imprinted, the English Bible, with annotations, faithfully translated and finished in this present year of our Lord God, a thousand five hundred and threescore, and dedicated to us." All other printers were forbidden to print the volume; and any offender was to forfeit "to our use forty shillings of lawful money of England for every such Bible at any time so printed." This license was granted even though Cawood & Jugge had been already appointed her majesty's printers, and though she had issued an injunction that no one should print any book without license by herself or six of her Privy Council, and the Company of Stationers are enjoined to be obedient.¹ Under Bodley's care a folio edition printed at Geneva was published, with date 10th April, 1561, but without a printer's name. A New Testament having no printer's name was also published in 1560.

Time went on, and Bodley, wishing to publish another impression, applied for the extension of his patent. Application was made to Sir William Cecil, but as the Bishops' Bible was in hand, he consulted Archbishop Parker and Grindal, Bishop

¹ A license was necessary for the New Testament without license, and sale of a book. At this time Har- he was fined eight shillings. Her- rison printed two editions of the bert's Ames, vol. II, p. 883.

of London. Parker in a cautious spirit wrote to Secretary Cecil praising the version; himself and the Bishop of London also wrote on 9th March, 1565, wishing that Bodley might have twelve years longer term "on consideration of the charges sustained by him and his associates in the first impression," admitting that it might "do much good to have diversity of translations;" ending, however, by declaring that, though the license might so pass well enough, the Secretary had been warned that "no impression should pass but by their direction, consent, and advice." Such conditions, if annexed to the grant, would have seriously impeded the liberty of the press, and they had not been insisted on with reference to other Bibles in former years. The proposal thus miscarried, and Bodley's patent is heard of no more. It has been held by some that the patent was renewed at the solicitation of the primate against the opinion of the queen and Cecil. But there is no proof on the point. On the other hand, if Bodley got the patent he certainly did not use it; for no Genevan Bible was printed from this time till after Parker's death. Neal¹ states that the request was refused on account of the prefaces and notes.

Three other impressions in 1568, 1569, 1570,² had been printed in Geneva; but after the last of these, no other editions issued from this foreign press. As the Bishops' Bible had the favour of those in high place, though Cranmer had shown no such partiality to his own edition, the Genevan Bible was not printed in England for fifteen years after its first publication, or in fact, during Archbishop Parker's lifetime. When commending to the royal notice his own revision in 1568, he urges the queen's recognition of it, "not only as many churches want their books, as that in certain places be publicly used some translations which have not been laboured in this realm," the allusion being to imported Genevan Bibles. But after his death complaints of the scarcity of those Bibles, and of tardiness in the publication of them began to be heard. "If that Bible were such as no enemy could justly find fault with them, many men marvel, that such a work being so profitable,

¹ History of the Puritans, p. 110, vol. I, London, 1837.

² Printed by John Crespian.

should find so small favour as not to be printed again."¹ But in 1575 the Genevan Bible was first printed in England, in quarto and octavo. During the same year also, two editions of the New Testament of 1557 had been already printed, all three books by Vautroullier for Christopher Barkar.²

In 1576 the Genevan New Testament was edited by Laurence Tomson, under-secretary to Sir Francis Walsingham. The title was—

"The New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, translated out of Greek by Theodore Beza. Whereunto are adjoined briefe summaries of doctrine upon the Evangelists and Acts of the Apostles, together with the method of the Epistles of the Apostles, by the said Theodore Beza. And also short expositions on the phrases and hard places taken out of large annotations of the foresaid author, and Joach. Camerarius, by P. Loseler Villerius.³ Englished by L. Tomson. Together with the annotations of Fr. Junius upon the Revelation of St. John. London. Imprinted by Christopher Barkar dwelling in Powles Churchyard, at the sign of the Tygres head."

There is a dedication to Walsingham and Hastings, with a vignette containing the crest of the former, a tiger's head;⁴ and there is also a translation into English of Beza's address to Louis of Bourbon, Prince of Condé. There are not many variations in the text, but the marginal notes are different, certainly not so pithy and compact as those of the original Genevan, yet sometimes so numerous as to form a continuous comment, as in the Apocalypse. Tomson's revision has one peculiarity which sometimes appears in the Authorized Version, that of translating the article in connection

¹ History of the Troubles at Frankfurt, p. cxcv.

² Barker's royal patent included the printing of all Bibles and Testaments whatsoever in the English language of any translation, with notes or without notes.

³ Loseler Villerius is the Latinized name of M. L'Oyseleur, seigneur de

Villers. The title-page is vague and misleading.

⁴ In a short time after this the printer changed his name to Barker, or about the period that he bought from Sir Thomas Wilkes a patent for printing Bibles. The tiger's head, the armorial bearing of Walsingham his patron, was set over his shop.

with some proper names or epithets by the demonstrative pronoun "that." Thus, in the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, 1, "In the beginning was that word, and that word was with God, and that word was God"; 4, "and that life"; 5, "that light"; 8, twice the Authorized Version follows the same practice; 9, "that true light"; 14, "that word became flesh"; 20, "I am not that Christ," followed by the Bishops'; 21, "art thou that prophet?" repeated in the Bishops' and in the Authorized; 25, "that Christ," also in the Bishops', "nor that prophet," similarly in the Authorized; 29, "behold that Lamb of God"; 32, "I beheld that Spirit"; 33, "that Spirit"; 34, "that sonne of God"; 36, "that Lamb of God"; 41, "that Messias"; 45, "Jesus that sonne of Joseph"; 49, "that sonne of God, that king of Israel"; 51, "upon that sonne of man." This New Testament was very often reprinted with the Genevan Bible, and it appears in the Scottish edition printed by Andrew Hart, Edinburgh, 1610.

During 1583, the first year of Whitgift's primacy, the dedication to Elizabeth prefixed to twelve editions, seven of them published in London, was withdrawn in the twenty-fifth year of her reign; but the withdrawal, whatever might be its motive, did not hinder the sale. The original and catholic title of the epistle: "To our beloved in the Lord, the brethren of England, Scotland, and Ireland," found in ten editions, or down to 1582, was changed first into, "To the diligent and Christian reader," and then curtailed into, "To the Christian reader"; but such disparaging alterations did not mar the great popularity of the volume. It came at length to enjoy such a pre-eminence as to be read in churches, and to be used in pulpits; preachers took their texts from it, and quoted it in their discourses. It grew to be in greater demand than the Bishops' or Cranmer's. Ninety editions of it were published in the reign of Elizabeth, as against forty of all the other versions. Of Bibles as distinct from New Testaments there were twenty-five editions of Cranmer's and the Bishops'; but sixty of the Genevan. Yet Whitgift says in 1587: "Divers, as well parish churches as chapels of ease,

are not sufficiently furnished with Bibles, but some have either none at all or such as be torn and defaced, and yet not of the translation authorized by the Synod of Bishops."

The influence of Archbishop Grindal on his translation to the primacy has been sometimes supposed, as by Cardwell,¹ to have suddenly promoted the sale and use of Genevan Bibles; but the primate was long under the royal frown, and lived in privacy. Nor does Cardwell give any proof; for all that he says is, that though it had not been reprinted for several years previously, five different editions made their appearance within two years after Grindal's removal from York to Canterbury. He does not attempt to point out any actual connection of cause and effect. Parker, indeed, must have been indifferent, if not hostile, to a translation made in Geneva. He was so profoundly jealous of the returned exiles, and thought their theories so dangerous to Church and State, that he did all in his power to repress the free ventilation of their opinions. Such discussions might have been safe and healthy; for convictions repressed in utterance gather strength till they culminate in a perilous explosion. The primate's views were so well known that nobody ventured to print the Genevan Bible in his latter years. Not that he formally inhibited the publication of it; but his power, especially as bearing on the press, was felt to be a force not to be tampered with. Grindal had puritanical proclivities, and suffered for his refusal to obey in all things the self-willed daughter of Henry VIII—"supreme governor of the Church of England." But he did not show any undue partiality for the Genevan version. One of the questions issued by him to the ordinaries was whether each church had a copy of the English Bible in the largest volume; and he bequeathed to the church of his native parish of St. Bees his "fairest Bible of the translation appointed to be read in the church." Grindal's successor, Whitgift, who drew up the nine Lambeth articles, could have no objection to the Calvinistic marginal notes of the Genevan version. Another reason for its great popularity may be assigned with some plausibility. The queen did not love "prophesying," or even "preaching"; "it was

¹ Documentary Annals, vol. II, p. 12.

good," she said, to have "few preachers—three or four might suffice for a county, and that the reading of the homilies to the people was sufficient." So that in London only about half the churches had preaching ministers. The people were, therefore, obliged to read the Bible for themselves; the notes of the Genevan version became doubly precious to them, and the circulation was in this way quickened and increased. The Bishops' Bible was not issued beyond 1606, five years before the date of the publication of the Authorized Version, though its New Testament was printed in 1608, 1614, 1615, 1617, 1618. But the Genevan Bible continued to be printed after 1611. Nay, in that very year it was issued in folio by Barker himself, the king's printer. Besides four editions of the New Testament, the Bible was reprinted in quarto in 1613 both at London and Edinburgh, again at London in 1614; with two editions in 1615, and a last issue in folio in 1616; it appeared in quarto, Amsterdam, in 1633, in folio 1640, with two more editions in 1644. In 1649 the Authorized Version was printed in quarto with the Genevan notes,¹ as if to promote the circulation. An edition of this nature was published in 1679 in folio, and as late as 1708² and 1715; but the one of 1679 and the other two tell a falsehood on their title-page, "which notes have never been before set forth with this new translation."³

Thus the Genevan version continued to be used by many preachers and authors, even after the Authorized Translation was issued in 1611. It commended itself to many who, from education, position, and circumstances, might have cherished prejudices against it. Not only men of position and learning, but others of a wholly different stamp, were fond of it. Archbishop Abbot, when Master of University College, Oxford, and Vice-Chancellor, published in 1600 "An Exposition upon the

¹ London, printed by the Company of Stationers, with the title placed in the usual heart-shaped oval.

² These Bibles of 1679 and 1708 are the same book with only the alteration of date. The edition in

1679 had not sold, and in 1708 it was simply reissued.

³ In 1578 was published a folio edition with a double version of the Psalms, the Genevan in Roman character, and the earlier version of the prayer book in black letter.

Book of Jonah," a series of lectures delivered in St. Mary's Church, and he uses throughout the Genevan version, and not the Bishops'. Dr. Walter Balcanquhall, Dean of Rochester, in a sermon preached before the king, and published by his majesty's command, in 1632, uses the Genevan Bible. The "ever memorable" John Hales, of Eton, often quotes the same version. Dr. Skinner, in succession bishop of Bristol, Oxford, and Worcester, does the same in two sermons published by royal command in 1634. Dr. Gervase Babington, a pupil of Whitgift, and bishop in turn of Llandaff, Exeter, and Worcester, one of the members of the Hampton Court conference, uses the Genevan version in his sermons preached at court and in his theological works. Dr. Richard Montagu, Bishop of Norwich, and a great favourite of King James, often quotes from the same version in his "Acts and Monuments of the Church," 1642. The same practice is usually followed by Bishop Overall, one of King James' translators, in his "Convocation Book," which when first printed in 1689 carried the license of Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury. Dillingham, another of King James' translators, continued to quote the Genevan after 1611.

It may be noted in passing that a vernacular Bible, such as the Genevan, was ever identified with Protestantism. Esmé Stuart, Duke of Lennox, one of the "vilest men" that had ever been "exalted" in Scotland, hypocritically professed, when an exile in Paris in 1583, to be turning a Huguenot, and he asked Cobham, as a proof of his sincerity, "to bestow a Bible on him." And the feeling was similar in France—the French Bible was also associated with Protestantism. When the Huguenot town of Orange was taken by Catholic troops, ladies of good birth were given up to the soldiery, and then left in the streets without clothing, or their naked bodies were pasted over with leaves torn from "their Genevan Bibles."

CHAPTER XXXVI.

THE Genevan Bible soon after its publication came into general use in Scotland. Knox follows Tyndale's version in some of his earliest works, but after 1560 he adopts the Genevan, and so do the other divines and polemics, as Bruce, Rollock, and Ferguson—the last giving the words a Scottish form and spelling, as "quhilk" for which, "gif" for if, "behauld" for behold, "tiends" for tithes. Chapman and Millar were established as printers in Edinburgh about 1507 in the reign of James IV, but there were then no English Bible to put to press. Lekprevik was specially appointed king's printer, and was licensed to print Bibles in 1564, and the Genevan Bible in 1568; but he never printed a copy of the Scriptures. The people, however, were well supplied by importation from England and from the Continent. Tyndale's translation was never printed in Scotland, though it was extensively used. Lewis indeed says that a quarto edition of Tyndale was "very probably" printed in Scotland in 1536;¹ but the peculiar spelling of the edition to which he apparently refers seems to have led him to the baseless conjecture.² Some writers apparently translated for themselves, as Chaucer had done, and he is in this respect followed by Lyndsay in the "Complaynt of Scotland," 1548, and by Balnavis, one of the Lords of Session, in his "Confession of Faith," compiled the same year and printed in 1584.

The leading reformers or Protestant nobles in Scotland held a meeting at Stirling in March, 1557, the year of the publication of the first Genevan Testament, and agreed

¹ History, p. 85, 2nd edition.

² See vol. I, page 234.

to send a letter to Knox, who was then in Geneva. Another consultation was held in Edinburgh, and a "common band was made" on the 3rd of December, 1557—its central point being "with all diligence continually to apply our whole power, substance, and our very lives to maintain, set forward, and establish the most blessed Word of God." They agreed also on two heads of policy, (1) "That the English Book of Common Prayer should be read publicly in the parish kirks on Sundays and other festivals, with the lessons of the New and Old Testament; and if the curates of the parishes be qualified, to cause them to read the same, and if they be not, or if they refuse, that the most qualified in the parish use and read them. (2) That doctrine, preaching, and interpretation of Scriptures be had and used privately in quiet houses, without great conventions of the people thereto, till afterward God shall move the prince to grant public preaching by faithful and true ministers." The Primate of St. Andrews longed for vengeance against these evangelical agitators, and summoned before him Argyle's preacher, who, secure in Inverary, and surrounded by Highland claymores and targets, laughed him to scorn. So foiled, he then fell upon a frail old man of eighty-two years of age, who read and preached his Bible, and sentenced him on the 20th April, 1558, to the fire. This doom pronounced on Walter Mill so stirred the city of St. Andrews that not a man would sell or lend a rope to bind him, or a tar-barrel to burn him. His martyrdom made such an impression against his prosecutors that he was the last victim of the Popish period. The nation was roused, images were torn away, and the great idol of St. Giles was first drowned in the Nor' Loch and then burned.

The reformers, well aware where their great strength lay, presented a petition to the Regent in 1558, and asked especially for these things—(1) "That as they were already allowed by law to read the Scriptures in their common tongue, it should also be made lawful to them to convene publicly or privately to our common prayers in our vulgar tongue. (2) That it should be lawful, if in their meetings any hard place of Scripture should be read, that any qualified persons in knowledge, being

present, should interpret and open up the said hard places, to God's glory and the profit of the auditory. (3) That the holy sacrament of baptism should be used in the vulgar tongue, and the god-fathers and church then assembled should be instructed in their duties. (4) That the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper should likewise be ministered in the vulgar tongue, and in both kinds." The Regent-Dowager was French, and she at length replied in broken English, "Me will remember," she exclaimed, "what is protested, and me will put good order after this to all things that now be in controversy."¹ Such an answer from a daughter of the House of Guise was only a pretext.²

It seems surprising at first sight that no Scottish scholars or divines of that time or the period succeeding it set themselves to the work of Biblical revision or translation. There were men at that epoch quite qualified for the work. Knox was not without erudition, but his high vocation was one of public activity and national enterprise. His keen spirit was kept in a state of perpetual anxiety and excitement, for he believed his struggle to be with "spiritual wickedness in high places," and he was denied the privacy and leisure, without which the higher regions of scholarship cannot be reached. Andrew Melville was declared on leaving college to be the "best Grecian of any young master in the land," and at the age of twenty-one he was appointed regent in a foreign seminary. He was wont to travel with a Hebrew Bible "slung from his belt"; he studied Syriac at Geneva; and rose to be the learned reformer and principal of two native universities. It is matter of regret that he should have spent his varied and masculine powers in composing Latin verses³ to rival those of Buchanan and Beza. George Buchanan translated the Psalms into Latin, and spent

¹ Lorimer's Scottish Reformation, James V at St. Andrews in June, pp. 204, &c. Walter Mill had been 1538.

arrested and condemned in 1538, but escaped to Germany, where he remained twenty years.

³ His *Carmen Mosis* and his *Stephaniskion* are well known, and of the second of these poems Scaliger said *nos talia non possumus*.

² She was the widow of the Duke of Longueville, and was married to

many years abroad lingering on the heights of Parnassus rather than on the hill of God. There were others, like Ales, Rollock, Gillespie, and Cameron, who delighted in Biblical study, but did not engage in the production of a vernacular Bible. In apology, however, it may be said that the pastorate in Scotland is an office of constant labour and travel, and that there are no rich benefices, prebendal stalls, or colleges with wealthy clusters of fellowships; and that in other days ministers had often to seek places of concealment, "rocks, dens, and caves," which were more in request than library or study; and that edicts and proclamations concerned them more than Greek or Hebrew; for the hand that might have turned over with busy care the pages of a lexicon or grammar had sometimes to apply itself to pike and musket.

During the reign of James V, and the minority of his daughter, there was a close connection between Scotland and France; and many Scotchmen, both Catholic and Protestant, studied at foreign universities. The Swiss States came also into friendly intercourse with Caledonian divines and reformers, and the name and fame of Calvin and his compeers were as great in Scotland as in his own country. The French tongue was familiarly spoken at the Scottish court, and was also well known by the better classes through the country. Therefore a Bible prepared and published at Geneva was sure to find a ready welcome, especially north of the Tweed, and the republication of it formed an epoch in Scottish ecclesiastical history.¹

The Genevan version was originally published in the very year in which there met at Edinburgh the first Protestant General Assembly of the Kirk—in 1560. As it was the first

¹ The conversations which John Knox had with Queen Mary at Holyrood, and which are told by him in his history in broad Scotch, must have been conducted in French. Indeed many French terms are still preserved in the common speech of Scotland, as *dour*, obstinate; *douce*, quiet; *aumrie*, cupboard; *braw*, fine; *bein*, well-to-do (*bien*); *gou*, taste; *asht*, meat-dish; *jigot*, leg of mutton; *grozets*, gooseberries; *caraffe*, a crystal water-jug; *fashious*, troublesome; *ghean*, a wild cherry; and *haggis* (*hachis*).

Bible issued in Scotland, the interesting story of the printing of it in the "antient kingdom" may be allowed to occupy a few pages. In March, 1575, Alexander Arbuthnot, merchant burgess of Edinburgh, and Thomas Bassandyne, printer, presented a petition to the General Assembly, containing a proposal to print the English Bible. The Assembly at once assented to the request, and "anent this godly proposition it is agreed betwixt this present Assembly and the said Alexander and Thomas, that every Bible which they shall receive advancement for shall be sold in albes (sheets) for £4 13s. 4 pennies Scottis,¹ keeping the volume and character of the said proofs delivered to the clerk of the Assembly." Application was ordered to be made "to the Lord Regent's² grace" that the necessary ratification for printing be given, and that a reasonable "gratitude" be appointed to such "as should be employed for correcting of the said Bible, at the cost of the said Alexander and Thomas"; "the Kirk promesing to deliver the authentick copy, which they shall follow, to them, betwixt and the last day of April." Cautioners were found and solemnly pledged on behalf of the printers that the work should be "perfected betwixt and the last day of March, 1576." The "perfidum ingenium" soon displayed itself, bishops, superintendents,³ commissioners are "taken bound" at once to "do utter and exact diligence to raise the necessary funds at the hands of the lords, barons, and gentlemen of every parish"; and it is enjoined, "that every person that is provided of old, as well as of new, be compelled to buy a Bible to their parish kirk, and to

¹ The old Scottish currency was only the twelfth in value of sterling money, a pound Scots being only one shilling and eightpence, or twelve pounds Scots equal to one pound sterling.

² James Douglas, Earl of Morton, was elected Regent, 24th November, 1572, on the death of the Earl of Mar.

³ The superintendents are distinguished from bishops, as their office

was only a matter of "temporary expedience" to fill up vacant parishes. They could not act of their sole authority in admitting ministers; and if they fell into sin, they were liable to the same sentences as their brethren. They were admitted themselves as other ministers were, their jurisdiction was wholly regulated by the synods, and they were responsible to the General Assembly for all parts of their conduct.

advance therefor the price foresaid, and the said prices to be collected and inbrought by the said bishops, superintendents, and visitors within each bounds and shire, within their jurisdiction, betwixt and the last day of June." At the next Assembly, in August, 1575, the work of printing and correcting was spoken of, the printers' statement being, "Anent the supplication given in to the General Assembly by Alexander Arbuthnot, making mention that whereas it is not unknown to your wisdoms, what great work and charge I have enterprised, concerning the imprinting of the Bible, for accomplishing whereof your wisdoms understood that the office of a corrector, his diligence and attendance therein, is most necessary: and therefore I humbly desire your wisdoms to request my Lord Abbot of Dunfermline to licentiate Mr. George Young, his servant, whom I think most fit to attend upon the said work of correctorie, to concur and assist me during the time of my travell, to the effect that the notable work begun and enterprised may be consummat and perfected in all points. The charges and expenses of his travels I shall reasonably deburse conforme to your wisdoms' discretion, so that the work may pass forward and be decent, as the honesty of the same requires." Letters of privilege or a license from the Privy Council were obtained June 30, authorizing Arbuthnot and Bassandyne "to prent or cause be imprentit, set furth and sauld within this realm, or outwith the samen, Bibles in the vulgar Inglis tounge, in haill or in partes, with ane calendar for ten years, and discharging all his hienes lieges, that nane of them tak upon hand, to prent or cause be imprentit in ony carrecture or letter, translation or volume quhatsumever, sell or cause be sauld, brocht hame, or distribute to ony person or persones (except with consent of the said, &c.), providing they sell every bibill according to the prices appointed" (viz., £4, 13s. 4d.) Bassandyne¹ had died before the publication; and Arbuthnot, whose name alone appears on the title-page of the Old Testament, got power to print during his lifetime ordinary books, but special license to print and sell Bibles "in the

¹ His name alone stands on the title-page of the New Testament which was finished in 1576.

vulgar Inglis, Scottes, and Latine tounes." Thus the publication of this folio Bible was wholly an enterprise of the Church; for though the Regent Morton who issued the license, advanced some money to the printers, that money was only the sums collected in the various parishes according to the agreement "allowed and authorized by the Regent's grace."

The New Testament was ready in 1576, and the whole Bible in 1579:

"The Bible & Holy Scriptures contained in the Olde & Newe Testament, translated according to the Ebru & Greeke, & conferred with the beste translations in divers languages. With moste profitable annotations upon all the hard places of the Holy Scriptures & other things of great importance, mete for the godly reader. Printed in Edinburgh, Be Alexander Arbuthnot, Printer to the Kingis Majestie, dwelling at ye Kirk of Field, 1579. Cum gratia. & privilegio regie majestatis."

The title-page has the royal arms of Scotland in the centre. The Bible was dedicated to the "Richt Excellent, Richt heich & michtie Prince James the Saxt, King of Scottis . . . &c.;" "From Edinburgh at our General Assemblie, the tent day of Julie, 1579." The Dedication, which was approved by the Assembly, speaks with honest plainness to the king—who was then about fourteen years of age, and there is a ring of gladness in the words addressed to him: "Certainlie we have great occasion baith to glorifie the gudeness of God toward this countrie, & also heichlie to extol your heines most godlie purpose & enterprise. O quhat difference may be seen between thir dayes of light when almaist in every private house the buike of God's law is red & understand in our vulgarie language, & that age of darknes when skarcelie in ane haill citie (without the clostres of monks & freires) culd the buke of God anes be founde, & that in ane strange tongue of Latin not gud, but mixed with barbaritie, used & red be fewe & almaist understand or exponit be nane; & quhen the false namit clergie of this realme, abusing the gentle nature of your hienes maist noble gudshir¹ of worthie memorie, made it an capital crime to be punished with the fyre to have or read the New Testament

¹ Grandfather—grandmother being gud-dame.

in the vulgar language; & to make them to all men more odious, as if it had been the detestable name of a pernicious sect, they were called New Testamenters." The impression now published was intended chiefly "to the end, that in every paroch kirk there suld be at least ane thereof kepit, to be called the common buke of the kirke, as a maist meet ornament for sik a place, & a perpetual register of the Word of God, the fountaine of all true doctrine, to be made patent to all the people of everie congregation as the only richt rule to direct & govern them in matters of religion, as also to confirm thame in the trueth receavit, & to reform and redress corruptions whensoever they may crepe in." Due honour is also given to the learned and laborious translators.

Matters were not done by halves; for an Act of Parliament was passed enacting that every householder worth 300 merks of yearly rent, and every yeoman or burgess worth £500 stock, was to have a Bible and Psalm Book in the vulgar language, under the penalty of ten pounds. This enactment was no dead letter, for "searchers" were appointed to visit all dwellings, and report as to their want or possession of a Bible. In 1580 "the magistrates and town council of Edinburgh issued a proclamation commanding all the householders to have Bibles," under the pains contained in the Act of Parliament, and advertising them that the Bibles are to be "sauld in the merchant buith of Andrew Williamson, on the north syde of this burgh, besyde the Meill Mercatt." On the 11th of November, 1580, "Alexander Clerk, of Balbery, provost, &c., ordanis the haille neighbours of this burgh to be callit in before the bailies by their quarters for not keeping of the said Act to be adjugeit in the unlaw therein contenit, & for eschewing of all fraude, ordanis sic as sall bring their bybills & psalm buiks to hafe their names writtin & subscryvit be the clerk: & thereafter the buiks deliverit to them." On the 16th of November, there was an order to pursue all persons "that has incurrit the payne of the Act for not having ane bybill or psalme buik." The printer had been slow in delivering copies, and the patience of the General Assembly was exhausted, so that, in July, 1580, they "propone to his majesty & council

that order be taken with Alexander Arbuthnot that the Bibles may be delyverit according to his receipt of money from every paroch, & to that effect that he & his severties (sureties) may be commandit be letters of horning for delyverance thereof, & na suspensioun to be grantit without the samyn be delyverit."¹

The Bible thus published in Scotland with all this array of civil and ecclesiastical prerogative, is the Genevan edition of 1561; the second folio edition being "the authentic copy" supplied by the General Assembly. The Scottish printer had not sufficient Greek types,² and under Rev. xiiij 18, he notes, "These Greke characters chi, xi, st [that is, χ ξ σ] signifie 666." Wodrow, the well known historian, vaguely and doubtfully says of this Bible: "I believe the Genevan translation was what they kept nearest to." But it was not an approximation at all—it was an exact reprint of the second edition, with all the notes and facsimiles of the cuts and maps, and the French terms attached to them, as Aquilon, midi, orient, occident. In the first edition of 1560 the supplementary words were printed in italics, but in the second edition they were put within brackets. This plan is followed in the Edinburgh reprint, but the printer had not apparently procured a sufficient number of bracket marks in time, for none are used in the Gospels; they appear first in the Acts of the Apostles. The proper names are furnished with accents, after Pagninus, as Heuáh, Iaakób,

¹ "Letters of horning" are, in Scottish law, a formal charge signed with the "Signet," and delivered to a debtor, commanding him to pay within a limited period; and if, at the expiry of such a term, he has not paid, an officer goes to the market cross of the burgh, and after three peals of a "horn" or trumpet, proclaims him a rebel, and then he may be put in prison not formally for debt, but for disloyalty. The process, changed by 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 114, is not wholly obsolete.

² In 1524, when Wynkyn de Worde printed a small book by Wakefield, on the study of Arabic and Hebrew, he was obliged to omit the third part, as he had exhausted his Hebrew types. Hebrew types were not used in Scotland till about 1599. Lekprevik the printer, in a book published by him in 1563, says of certain Greek words, "I had no characters to express them," and therefore he employed some "scolers" to write them with a pen on the sheets.

Izhák, Hábel, Káin, as in the first edition. The calendar and chronological notes were prepared and subscribed by Robert Pont, one of the ministers of the West Kirk, who was also one of the Lords of Session. One serious misprint of the "copy" was corrected—"Blessed are the place makers" for "peace makers," Matt. v, 3. There was also another error of the press in the contents of Luke xxi, "Christ condemneth the poor widow," for "commendeth."

The publication of the Genevan version at Edinburgh without any change in orthography, or any assimilation of its style to Scottish usage, shows that at this period, as at earlier times, the English of the south was quite intelligible to all the educated population of Scotland; and the fact is the more remarkable from the contrast between the text of the Bible and the distinctly Scottish dialect and spelling of the dedication to the young king. When the Earl of Murray appeared before Queen Elizabeth, in 1565, he spoke in Scottish, which her majesty interpreted to the French ambassador. No other edition of the Bible was published in Scotland for the next thirty years, or till 1610. In 1589 John Gibson purchased from Gilbert Masterton a patent which had been held by Archdeacon Young, of St. Andrews, giving liberty for printing within the realm, or causing to be printed within or without the realm, "the Bible in our own vulgar tongue, with the Psalm book, the double and single Catechise, with the Prognostications."¹ This patentee had "anc new psalme buik" "on his awin grit charges, and be his privat mean and devyse," printed at Middleburgh, in Flanders; and he received "free and only license and liberty to bring hame and sell the said impression at convenient prices, for seven years." Bibles from abroad were by enactment at this time freely imported into

¹ The name given to the tongue of the Island was English, and the First Book of Discipline, 1560, says, under the Nynte Heade, "We think it a thing most expedient and necessariethat everye church have a Bibill in Englishe." Yet even Dibdin calls this first Edinburgh reprint a Bible in the Scotch language, a proof that he had never inspected it. Edwards in his "Libraries," p. 438, complains of Dibdin's carelessness, and quotes a similar censure by Mr. Panizzi, lately of the British Museum.

Scotland, and were not to "pay the ordinary customs charge." These foreign editions were prized as being of good print and paper. In 1601, through Andro Hart and his partners, an edition was printed at Dort; and Hart printed in folio another Bible at Edinburgh in 1610—the Genevan version of the Old Testament, and Laurence Tomson's edition of the New. The edition of Hart was highly prized; and other and subsequent editions, to command a ready sale, inserted in their title-page, "Conform to the edition printed by Andro Hart." Two handsome folios, printed at Amsterdam in 1640 and in 1644, make this assertion—"According to the copy printed in Edinburgh by Mr. Andrew Hart, in 1610."

There had even been at one time some sort of overture made for a revision of the Genevan version. The records of the General Assembly which met at Burntisland, in May, 1601, contain the following minute:—"It being meinit be sundrie of the brethren, that thair was sundrie errors that meritit to be correctit in the vulgar translation of the Bible, the Assemblie hes concludit as follows: first, anent the translatione of the Bible, that every ane of the brethrene quha hes best knowlege in the languages, employ their travells in sundrie pairts of the vulgar translatione of the Bible that neides to be mendit, and to conferre the same together at the nixt Assemblie." But the proposal never took effect.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

THE Genevan version printed in England, or imported from the Continent, was the favourite volume in Scottish families, and kept its place for many years after the publication of the Authorized Version. Its very name endeared it to them, for the divines of Geneva ranked next to the "Twelve," in the loyal and loving esteem of Scottish Protestants. Knox had ministered in that city, Calvin and Beza had taught and preached in it. It was only natural that, as late as 1629, Zacharie Boyd should use the Genevan version in his "Last Battle of the Soul." Even those who were willing to conform to Episcopacy at the king's bidding, and to vindicate his high-handed procedure, were not disposed to accept his Bible; for its long use had hallowed the Genevan version to them. The diocesan synod of St. Andrews enacted, in 1611, the very year of our Authorized Version, "Forasmeikle as it was thought expedient that there be in every kirk ane commoune Bible, it was concludit that every brother sall urge his parochiners to buy ane of the Bybles laithlie printed be Andro Hart; and the brother failying either to cause buy ane of the Bybles as said is, or ellis to gif in his exact diligens, sall pay at the next synod, 6 lib money," *i. e.*, 10s. shillings sterling. This decision is the more remarkable, as at this very period Episcopacy was established, and the spiritual supremacy of the king was acknowledged; yet the older translation was formally preferred, when it must have been known that another was on the eve of publication, under royal patronage, for the sister community in England.

Sir James Sempill, of Beltrees, in a book dedicated to the

king, significantly called "Sacrilege Sacredly Handled," meant "for the Churches of North Britaine, 1619," uses the Genevan version. Dr. Guild, chaplain to Charles I, in his earliest works, published at London and Aberdeen, 1615, quotes from the Genevan version. Bishop Lindsay, of Brechin, inserts into the title-page of his "True Narration," published in 1621, as its motto, Prov. xxiv, 31, in the Genevan translation; and this narration is an apology for the Assembly which met at Perth, in 1618, and enacted the notorious "five articles," containing many characteristic elements of the Episcopalian ritual. Bishop Cowper, of Galloway, whose collected works were printed in London, 1629, uses the Genevan version. James Baillie, A.M., preached at Westminster a sermon on "Spiritual Marriage," and dedicated it to no less than nine Scottish peers, and seven other courtiers, and he uses the Genevan version. So does Struthers, a minister of Edinburgh, and one noted for his servility, in treatises published by him in 1628. Wischart, of Restalrig, in his "Exposition of the Lord's Prayer," follows the same practice; as also does Bishop Abernethy, of Caithness, in his "Physike for the Soule," London, 1638.¹ It is scarcely to be wondered at that the Alexander Henderson who presided at the General Assembly which met at Glasgow in 1638, and, by a sweeping act, declared Episcopacy overthrown in Scotland, should have used the Genevan version. So late as 1640, an edition of the Genevan Prose Psalms was printed at Edinburgh.

The vitality of the Genevan Bible was wonderful. It had commended itself to general acceptance, for it had been made by earnest and scholarly men, driven by persecution out of England; made in a city revered as the home and metropolis of the popular theology; and it was also a better translation than any of its rivals. It did not die under episcopal frown, nor was its circulation promoted to any extent by episcopal patronage. The people loved it for itself and its history. It was a contemporary of the Great Bible for nine years, and outlived it; and of the Bishops' for nigh forty years, and

¹ Memorial from the Bible Societies of Scotland, by Principal Lee, p. 90, &c. Edinburgh, 1824.

outlived it too for more than a quarter of a century. The Great Bible was not issued beyond 1569, nor the Bishops' after 1606; but the Genevan survived all these changes. Sometime in the reign of Charles I, the Genevan version, of which about one hundred and sixty editions had been published, sank gradually into disuse throughout the whole country. The king's printer issued impressions only of the Authorized Version which was now deservedly growing into favour, and Genevan Bibles had to be imported. Archbishop Laud, who had from his youth a great dislike of this version, and had shown it strongly when president of St. John College, forbade the importation of copies. This prohibition was one of the special charges brought against him on the trial which ended in his execution. His reply was that by the importation of books it was feared that "printing would be carried out of the kingdom, for those books were better print, better bound, better paper, and for all the charges of bringing sold better cheap."¹ Though King James had scornfully depreciated the Genevan notes at the Hampton Court Conference, the people relished them greatly, and, according to Fuller, when the version was disappearing, they complained that they "could not see into the sense of Scripture for lack of the spectacles of those Genevan annotations." The Genevan Bible having done its work at length passed away, making room for another version in so many respects its superior.

The Genevan version was attacked about the year 1611 by a Dr. Howson in a sermon preached at St. Mary's, Oxford, his charge being that it contained misinterpretations leading to the denial of the Divinity and Messiahship of Jesus Christ, and thus favouring Arianism and Judaism. The accusation is utterly groundless, and must have been the result of strange misconception and prejudice. Dr. Abbot suspended the preacher for the publication of such a libel. During the trial a letter from Thomas Bodley "in defence and praise" of the translators was read "from St. Marie's pulpit." This most popular of the

¹ The phrase occurs in the Authorized Version, 2 Esdras xvi, 21, "victuals shall be good cheape," after the Bishops', the Genevan, the Great Bible, and Coverdale.

older versions was assaulted by Gregory Martin, in his "Discoverie of the Manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by heretickes of our daies, especially the English sectaries, in their English Bibles, used and authorized since the time of the Schism."¹ He affirmed that it was professedly translated from Beza, and thus gave the lie to its title-page, which has "translated according to the Ebrue and Greke." His own admission that in many places they dare not follow Beza is a proof that his charge cannot be sustained, for it is, as Fulke calls it, "an impudent slander." He asserts of the English heretics that Beza is their "chief translator and a captain among them, whom they profess to follow in the title of their New Testament, anno 1580, and by the very name of their Geneva Bibles."² The accusation is baseless, for the English refugees revised Tyndale and the Great Bible with all the helps in their power, and all the assistance which they could procure by consultation and correspondence. Again, this Bible is accused by Martin of concealing the truth when it says only "The Epistle to the Hebrews," omitting the name of Paul; but the prefatory note gives the reason, the want of uniform evidence, both of Greek writers and Latin, that Paul was the writer; and they are bold and learned enough to say that if it be Paul's, "it is not like"—"yea, seeing the Spirit of God is the author thereof, it diminisheth nothing of the autorite, although we know not with what penne he wrote it." The opinion of Geddes is similar to that of Martin, and he adds "that it was accompanied with notes by Beza, and hence obtained his name." But who ever heard of the Genevan being called Beza's Bible? though certainly Gregory Martin again and again stigmatizes the English Protestants by the name of Bezites.³ The opinion of Father Simon⁴ need scarcely

¹ Rhemes, 1582.

printed twice, and many times afterwards.

² The allusion is to Tomson's revision of 1576, the title-page of which somewhat strangely announces that it is "translated out of Greeke by Theod. Beza."

³ Prospectus. Mason Good's Memoirs of Dr. Geddes, p. 125, London, 1803.

⁴ Critical Enquiries (English translation), p. 231, London, 1684.

be noticed, that the Genevan is the French Bible printed at Geneva, "the which was made English." The influence of Olivetan's version is now and then apparent, but it is not specially frequent or prominent.

Lastly, a peculiar criticism on the Genevan translation came from a very unexpected quarter, the author being John Hamilton, a relation or close friend of him of Bothwellhaugh, who, after being formally pardoned by the Regent Murray on the field of Langside, killed him within a brief period by a cowardly shot from a window in Linlithgow, the house being owned by one Hamilton, the Archbishop of St. Andrews,¹ and the musket borrowed from another, the Abbot of Arbroath. Mary Stewart, the royal sister of the murdered man, conferred a pension on the assassin.² Hamilton was a secular priest, and from his perpetual wanderings, intrigues, and conspiracies, he got the name of the "Skirmisher." He was one of the familiars of the Duke of Alva in his deeds of treachery and blood. He had been employed in the murder of Coligny; and Philip II for some time thought of him as one quite fitted in temperament and experience to "look after" the Prince of Orange; but his character was so notorious that his presence would have aroused suspicions. As the curé of St. Cosme in Paris, he was a prominent member of the League, and was heart and hand, too, in the sudden and illegal arrest of the president and jurist Barnabé Brisson, and his two fellow-judges Larcher and Tardif; in their execution, in the Petit Chatelet, two hours after their seizure; and in the exposure, after the tragedy, of their dead bodies in the Place de Grève. He became rector of the University of Paris in 1584, and published several treatises in defence of "halie kirk," in which are found some superstitions of the lowest and most ludicrous kind about the arts and wiles and common disguises of the Evil One. Bothwellhaugh, three years after, was willing to undertake the assassination of the

¹John Hamilton, archbishop, supposed to have planned the assassination of Darnley and of the Regent Murray, was seized at the capture of Dumbarton Castle, and hanged at

Stirling, April, 1571. "Assassination," as Mr. Froude says, "was an accomplishment in the family."

² Labanoff, vol. III, p. 341.

Prince of Orange, and he suggested two persons for the purpose. If there be no mistake about the name, the Skirmisher, when he felt the cause of Mary to be failing, sunk so low at length, that he sent from Brussels to the Regent Morton, "offering to do service either there with the Duke of Alva or with the Queen of Scots."¹ He had managed for some years the secret correspondence between Mary Stewart and Alva. A little volume of his compositions was published at Louvain in 1600, and a copy is in the Advocate's Library in Edinburgh.² Among them are some remarkably beautiful prayers, and some hymns above mediocrity. In the same volume, the work of one of the most daring of "bloody and deceitful men," is a series of remarks on the Genevan version, suggested by its popularity in his Protestant fatherland. His censure is headed, "Corruption of twenty-three passages of the Scriptures be the ministers' adulterous translations thereof in their Scottis Bible, and the causes why they have corruptit ye same." The places objected to are either in translations or notes connected with Popish dogma or ritual; the notes "obscuring or denying Christ's pretious bodie and bluid; maintaining heresie agains prayers for the daid and purgatorie; denying tradition, and affirming that Christ teacheth by his verie voce al thingis necessaires for treu religion." The critic has special objection to the Genevan note on Luke i, 28 and 42, for it defames the immaculat mother of God "whom they blaspheme as a sinner lyk uther wemen, and denies that the halie virgine Marie was blissit in hir self, and be the halines of hir awin godlie lyf." Notes against virginity, the sacrament of marriage, and the power of the priesthood, are also keenly reprobated, as also the rendering of "elders" for priests in James v, 14, "secret" for sacrament in Ephesians v, 32. Zechariah ix, 11, 12 is selected for strong censure, because neither in translation nor

¹ Froude's History, vol. IX, p. 577, Verteu, and Effects of the Sacraments: togidder with certain Prayers &c.

² "A Facile Treatise, conteland, of Devotion, &c., dedicat to his Sovereign Prince King James the Saxt. first, ane infalible rule to discern Treu from False Religion: nixt, a Declaration of the Nature, Number, Louvain, 1600."

notes is the old idea of Jerome and Cyril brought out, that the pit or lake is the *limbus patrum*, or, as Hamilton puts it, "it is meant to hyd the deliuerance of the patriarches and uthers, just men in the auld law, out of the lymbe of the fathers, callit in the Euangile Abraham's bosume, be Christ's descension into hel." The same objection is made to Acts ii, 27. Exodus v, 1 is selected for blame, because the translation "offer a sacrifice" has not been adopted "for God chieflie requires sacrifice of his treu worschippers." The note on Isaiah xix, 19, in reference to the altar of the Lord in the land of Egypt, is condemned as hiding the "external sacrifice of the Messe, whilk thay cal ane idole." Acts xiii, 23 is said to be corrupted "be their fals marginal note"—referring to popular election of ministers; as also the note to Malachi i, 11, where incense is explained by spiritual service. The "Skirmisher"¹ chose an unfamiliar beat when he laid aside cord, dagger, and disguise, and resorted to criticism, for it is utterly irrelevant; and he should have shown not the Protestant prepossessions, but the unscholarly failures of the Genevan versionists. He concludes his diatribe with a fierce warning: "Therefore, I beseek you, dissaivet people, to burn your corrupt Scots Bible in the fire, that your sauls be not tormentit with the intolerable pains of the fires of hell. This was the only cause why our Catholic bishops forbade the reading of the English Bible, that the corruptions thereof should not infect their sauls to eternal perdition."² It may be added that Hamilton returned to Scotland, and after finding "lurking holes" for some time, he was, in 1609, seized, and sent up to the Tower in London, where he died.

¹ Bannatyne, Knox's secretary, notes in his "Memorials," p. 51, "In the meantime there came from Flanders a little pink, and in it two gentlemen, with Mr. John Hamilton, called the Skirmisher, fra Duke d'Alva."

² Burton's History of Scotland, vol. V, p. 267; vol. VI, p. 271. Life of John Hamilton, a secular priest, by Dalrymple, Lord Hailes. Annals of Scotland, vol. III, p. 447. Edinburgh, 1819.

THE BISHOPS' BIBLE.

" Lord, Thy word abideth,
And our footsteps guideth ;
Who its truth believeth
Light and joy receiveth.

" When our foes are near us,
Then thy word doth cheer us,
Word of consolation,
Message of salvation.

" When the storms are o'er us,
And dark clouds before us,
Then its light directeth,
And our way protecteth.

" Who can tell the pleasure,
Who recount the treasure,
By Thy word imparted
To the simple-hearted ?

" Word of mercy, giving
Succour to the living ;
Word of life, supplying
Comfort to the dying !

" Oh that we, discerning
Its most holy learning,
Lord, may love and fear Thee,
Evermore be near Thee !"

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

QUEEN MARY died on the 17th of November, 1558, and was succeeded by her sister Elizabeth. The earlier part of Elizabeth's reign was beset with many difficulties. Old things were passing away, and it required delicate handling to settle the new order amidst doubts and distractions, deepened by political complications between Spain and France. The population was divided at the same time into hostile forces ; excesses of conservatism arrayed in self-defence on the one hand, and excesses of innovation battling to realize themselves on the other. The re-organization of the Church had been wondrously helped by the unusual number of vacancies on the episcopal bench. Only five of Edward's bishops, English and Irish, had survived the dark and disastrous reign of his sister ; and Cardinal Pole, who died on the same day with his royal mistress and kinswoman, had left several sees unfilled, so that at the opening of Elizabeth's first parliament only ten spiritual peers were present. There were a dozen dioceses without mitred heads, and according to De Feria, the Spanish ambassador, the Queen set over them *ministros de Lucifer*. Canterbury was filled by the consecration, at Lambeth, on the 17th December, of Matthew Parker, who had been one of Queen Anne Boleyn's chaplains and Dean of Lincoln, and he quietly succeeded Cardinal Pole, as if nothing had happened out of the usual course. His opinions on ecclesiastical matters suited Elizabeth and Cecil, and though he was a married dignitary, he had been so colourless a reformer that he easily escaped under the reign of Mary. When he was Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, he enacted that all students

taking the benefit of "Billingford's hutch" should offer prayer for the benefit of Billingford's soul; and he provided that the Duchess of Norfolk should be similarly remembered. He became, in course of time, as bitter against the "prophesyings"¹ as his royal mistress. He was a calm and erudite man of moderate opinions, and he regulated with no little skill the affairs of the church of which he was the ecclesiastical head; his motto being, "I take some heed not to extend my sleeve beyond mine arm." The choice of Parker was not only what is called a safe one, but it was also one of necessity; for among the able men around the throne, Jewel had in a moment of weakness abjured, Sandys had espoused the cause of Lady Jane Grey, Grindal was deficient in tact and firmness in the management of men and measures, Nowell was disliked by the queen, Lever, her favourite preacher, was a pronounced puritan, and Cox had been identified with the "Troubles" at Frankfort.²

The English Bible had slipped out of public view in the time of Mary, and though in her reign no edition of it was printed, many copies must have been secreted, for spies were prowling about, and the open possession and study of it involved individuals and households in immediate suspicion and jeopardy.³ The people were forbidden to read in their mother tongue the book which opened up salvation to them, and revealed those promises and hopes on which they rested their eternal well-being. Such things they might hear from the lips of a priest, but they were not to read for themselves the words of Evangelists or Apostles. They might listen to the sermon, but they durst not gaze upon the text. They might kneel before the crucifix, but were on no account to pause and pray over the story of the Gospels, and be in this way brought into living sympathy with Him that died for them. Sir Thomas More had admitted that "four-tenths of the people could never read English," yet though many persons had no educa-

¹ Yet Lord Bacon highly eulogizes the prophesyings, and describes their nature and benefit. Works, vol. VII, p. 86, ed. B. Montague.

² See page 4.

³ Thus a Bible of 1550 has on the fly-leaf, "Found in the hay-loft at Canterbury, October 10th, 1718."

tion at all, not a few of the uneducated class were well instructed in the truths of Scripture. It is told of Sir Walter Raleigh's mother, that in the perilous reign of Mary she went to visit a poor woman, named Agnes Prest, lying in Exeter jail, and soon to be martyred at Southernhay, and that the prisoner spoke to her so touchingly and ably against transubstantiation that she was confounded, saying, in her own record of the interview, "I was not able to answer her—I who can read, and she cannot." According to report, also though the woman was "of such simplicity, and without learning, you could declare no place of Scripture but she could tell you the chapter."¹ Want of common schooling kept this woman from reading Scripture; but Foxe² tells of another woman who, in the midst of poverty and darkness, felt the light, life, and riches of the divine Word. Joan Waste had been born blind, but had learned to support herself by knitting "hosen and sleeves," and occasionally helping her father to "twine ropes." Having gathered a little money, and bought a Bible, she got some friends to read it to her, and at various times she gave a penny to others to induce them to gratify her. Her great knowledge of Scripture became at length so notorious that she was "convented" before the bishop, and on being examined at length, she was condemned, and burned at Derby in 1556, being about twenty-two years of age.

But on the elevation of Elizabeth to the throne, the book which had been under ban for five years and four months started again into prominence. As the Princess Elizabeth, and when she was a virtual prisoner at Woodstock, in danger of her life, she was a pious student of the blessed book. Her own peculiar words, inscribed by herself on a MS. copy of the Epistles used by her are given thus: "August. I walke many times into the pleasant fieldes of the Holy Scriptures, where I plucke up the goodliesome herbes of sentences by pruning: eate them by reading: chawe them by musing: and laie them up at length in the hie seate of memorie by gathering them together: that so having tasted theire sweetness I may the

¹ Life of Sir Walter Raleigh, by Edward Edwards, vol. I, p. 19. London, 1868.

² Foxe, vol. VIII, p. 247.

lesse perceave the bitterness of this miserable life." In the sixteenth year of her reign we find, too, she was in possession of "Oone Gospell booke covered with tissue, and garnished on th' onside with the crucifix, and the queene's badges of silver guilt, poiz with wodde, leaves, and all, cxii. oz."¹

At length, when her sister had died, and she was leaving the Tower, on the day before her coronation, she looked up to heaven, and offered the following thanksgiving: "Oh Lord, Almighty and Everlasting God, I give thee most humble thanks that thou hast been so merciful unto me as to spare me to behold this joyful day; and I acknowledge that thou hast dealt wonderfully and mercifully with me. As thou didst with thy servant Daniel the prophet, whom thou deliveredst out of the den, from the cruelty of the raging lions, even so was I overwhelmed, and only by Thee delivered. To Thee, therefore, only be thanks, honour, and praise for ever. Amen."

According to traditional story, when, after offering this prayer, she went through London in procession, and was passing the "Little Conduit in Cheape," a pageant was prepared to salute her, for "Time" was placed there, and "Truth, the daughter of Time," holding in her hand the *verbum veritatis*—an English Bible—which she delivered to the Queen. Her Majesty received the gift with royal graciousness and kissed it. Then "thanking the city for their goodly gift," and pressing it to her bosom, she said that she would "diligently read therein." A person in the crowd, as if suddenly recollecting who it was that first gave the English Bible to the nation, lustily cried out, "Remember old King Harry the Eighth!" and "a gleam of light passed over Elizabeth's face" at the mention of her father's name in this connection. Lord Bacon also records that hints were given to her to release certain prisoners, as the four Evangelists and the Apostle Paul, long shut up, and that she "answered very gravely, that it was best first to inquire of themselves whether they would be released or no." In a short time, however, she issued a proclamation containing these injunctions: "To provide, within three months after this visitation, at the charges of the parish, one book of the

¹ Archæologia, vol. XIII, p. 221.

whole Bible of the largest volume in English, and within one twelve months the paraphrases of Erasmus, also in English; and the same to be set up in some convenient place within the said church, where the parishioners may most conveniently resort and read the same. All persons under the degree of A.M. shall buy for their own use the New Testament in Latin and English, with paraphrases, within three months. Inquiry was to be made whether any parsons, vicars, or curates, did discourage any person from reading any part of the Bible, either in Latin or English."

She took the Great Seal from Heath, but retained him in her Privy Council, along with twelve others who had served her sister, and to them she added eight new members, her Lord Keeper being Sir Nicholas Bacon. Her sister's bishops had resolved not to crown her; but Oglethorpe, of Carlisle, broke the compact, and went through the ceremony of coronation and anointing, other bishops being also present, to one of whom Bonner had lent his episcopal robes.

Though no direct encouragement might thus be drawn by non-catholics from the queen's demeanour, the more intelligent and enterprising of her subjects hoped for an open and uncontrolled circulation of the Scriptures, and they were not disappointed. Elizabeth's conduct, however, must have greatly perplexed many observers, for in religion she was, and continued to be, somewhat of an enigma; and what her relation to the English Bible might ultimately be was veiled in uncertainty. There were omens both of promise and of discouragement. On Wotton's refusal, the chair of Canterbury was said, at the time, to have been offered to Feckenham, Abbot of Westminster, who had been chaplain to Bishop Bonner. Mass was sung by the queen's desire, not only at the funeral of her sister and that of Cardinal Pole, but Convocation was opened with high mass, in 1559, and it was said in the churches from November, 1558, to June, 1559. Negotiations for an alliance between her and Rome were in progress, but they were frowned upon by Pope Paul IV, who formally excommunicated her in April, 1570. She attended mass herself, but forbade the elevation of the host. She would not admit a papal nuncio, for she detested

the Romish domination, though she had little or no sympathy with the theology of Protestantism. In the royal chapel a crucifix stood for a considerable period on the altar, with lights burning before it.¹ Jewel denounced "the idol," and Parkhurst sent to Bullinger the good news of its demolition. Her father had taken the title of Supreme Head of the Church, but she was content with that of Supreme Governor. In 1560 she assured De Quadra that she was as good a catholic as he was, and that she had been compelled to do as she did; and yet, during the course of the same year, she resolved to take Scotland under her protection, as "a Christian realm in the profession of Christ's true religion." She talked to Mendoza of reconsidering her ecclesiastical position; but she still held on her way, and took no penitent step toward reconciliation with the Holy Father. While she was coquetting with Spain and France, she enjoined on Randolph to certify to the Lords of the Congregation north of the Tweed, that, in her view, "no basis of amity between nations is so sure as that grounded on unity and consent in religion," though she had been greatly displeased with the Scottish Confession on its first publication in 1560. Professing at one time a desire to settle the succession to the crown of England in favour of the Queen of Scots, she made it a condition that Mary must accept the Reformation, and yet the ritual which she admired herself was more than semi-catholic, while she was using every effort to bind her own clergy to celibacy.² Her eagerness for uniformity led to its enforcement in London, and to the exclusion, in consequence, of thirty-seven of its ministers. Other recusants were cruelly punished, and men like Penry, Thacker, Greenwood, and Barrow were executed. When Catholic Europe combined against

¹ Jewel was so displeased that he said, "As Christ was (in Mary's time) thrown out by his enemies, so he is now kept out by his friends."

² The story was current at the time that, after being sumptuously entertained by Archbishop Parker, the queen, at her departure, after

thanking the primate, turned round to his wife—the wife of the first peer of the realm—and said, "And you —madam I may not call you, and mistress I am ashamed to call you —but yet do I thank you."—*Harrington, Nugæ Antiquæ*, vol. ii, p. 16.

her she rose to the occasion, as when the Armada filled the Channel in 1588; but when Protestants stood sadly in need of men and money, she sternly refused them. She treated her clergy with queenly scorn, silenced one bishop, and threatened to unfrock another. She haughtily interrupted Dean Nowell's discourse in St. Paul's, for she disliked his iconoclasm, and she detested the pulpit from her inability to control its utterances. But in spite of her Laodicean position toward the church of Cranmer which had been founded under her father, and under him had experienced many oscillations, she never imitated Henry in his treatment of the English Bible. The various versions in use were neither impeded nor patronized by her. She thought that the nation might flourish with few sermons and fewer presses; but she never attempted to limit the supply of Bibles; nay, she commanded by proclamation the reading of the Gospel, the Epistle for the day, and the Ten Commandments in the vulgar tongue. Though she kept several of the sees long vacant, and appropriated the revenues, she never meddled with the circulation and reading of the Divine volume in any diocese. The Court of High Commission and the Star Chamber were crowded with ecclesiastical causes, but the printers and publishers of the Scriptures were in no way molested. Imperious enactments were issued, mulcting those who would not attend church; but no such commands were twined round the English Bible. She often interfered with debates in Parliament, and used uncourteous language in her rebukes; and her royal assent was refused in one year to no less than forty-eight bills which had passed both houses; but she kept aloof from the Bibles in circulation, and, in her own words, spoken on another point, she would not consent that they should be either "abled or disabled."

Grafton reprinted a tract, first published on the accession of Edward in 1547, "A Godly Invective in the defence of the gospel against such as murmur and do what they can that the Bible should not have free passage; very necessary to be read of every faithful Christian. By Philip Gerrard, yeoman of King Edward's Chamber." Such a publication must have stirred up not a few to covet copies of the English Scriptures, and to be

thankful for them if already they possessed them. The queen's proclamation had restored the Great Bible to its rank of the authorized version. Tyndale's, Coverdale's, the Great Bible, and the Genevan were also in circulation, and if we reason from the number of impressions, Tyndale and the Genevan were by far the most popular. The Cranmer folio was first published in her majesty's reign in 1562, by Harrison; a quarto edition, printed by Cawood, having come out during the previous year. Jugge had also sent abroad two editions of the New Testament. "A very fine and pompous" edition of the Great Bible was also printed by Hamillon, at Rouen, in 1566, "at the cost and charges of Richard Carmarden, of the Customs." Grafton, who had been engaged in printing the Scriptures for nigh thirty years, issued an edition in one volume octavo—the first of that handy size.¹ These editions supplied the nation for six or seven years, so that there was little lack of choice; but the Great Bible and the Genevan were brought into direct competition.

These translations differed on many minor points, but they contained the same disclosure of essential truths; and they had all a close genetic relationship, the one arising out of the other, the version of Tyndale being the primal source, especially recognizable after several revisions. Bishop Hooper, writing in 1554, from his prison, an "*Appellatio ad Parlamentum*," asserts the desirableness of a revision, and that he had discussed and urged the matter with pious and learned brethren, affirming, however, his ability to prove that the English Bible is nearer the Hebrew than the translation usually ascribed to Jerome.² It was natural in such circumstances that there should be a desire for another version, which from its superiority might supersede all rivals. Parker had at the same time a passion for uniformity, and insisted on it without reserve or modification, being, as Fuller calls him, "a Parker indeed, careful to keep the fences."

¹ The greater portion of this edition, to the extent of 7,000 copies, is said to have been sent over to Ireland, and such was the good or bad usage that these books met with, that not a single copy is known to be in existence.

² *Later Writings*, p. 393, Parker Soc. ed.

He did not like men that were not, to use his own epithet, "disciplinable" men. But it was both right and natural in him to try and publish a Bible which might be accepted as the one Bible of the English people. The bishops and clergy could not but feel, if they were at all interested in critical study, that the Great Bible needed revision, and they could scarcely be expected to acquiesce in the Genevan version, though it had been made by Englishmen; for in its origin they had no hand, and over its renderings and notes they had possessed no control. It was also becoming identified more and more with the freer and bolder party in the Church, who were not only Calvinists in theology, but were struggling against rigid and universal conformity. In fact, the Genevan was greatly the better translation of the two in use, and Cranmer's must have suffered from the contrast.

The originator of the proposal for another revision or translation is not mentioned—probably there had been various suggestions growing in number and importunity. Matthew Parker, seventieth Archbishop of Canterbury, was himself an excellent scholar, far in advance of his episcopal compeers and fond of Biblical studies. Born at Norwich in 1504, he was educated at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, of which he was elected a fellow, and then master in 1543; becoming vice-chancellor two years afterwards. He had declined a place in Wolsey's new college at Oxford, and was made Dean of Lincoln in 1552. He spent many academical years of earnest study, so that he possessed no small portion of patristic and antiquarian learning, as may be seen in many of his works. The primate must have been well aware of the inferiority of the Great Bible, for it had been a work of haste, though it was the result of two revisions by one editor. Sandys, Bishop of Worcester, was also fully alive to the importance of the measure, and quite competent to advise upon it. In a letter to the Archbishop he declares, "Your grace should much benefit the Church in hastening forward the Bible which you have in hand: those that we have be not only false printed, but also give great offence to many by reason of the depravity in reading." But neither the queen, nor Convocation, nor Parliament uttered a voice in

the matter. The Queen had so little to do with the enterprise that the Archbishop was in some hesitation about writing her as to the completion of the Bible; and having composed a letter to her, he sent it to Cecil, and asked him to use his "opportunity of delivery." About 1563, the primate set about the new enterprise. Strype describes his method of procedure:¹

"Among the noble designs of this archbishop must be reckoned his resolution to have the Holy Bible set forth, well translated into the vulgar tongue for private use as well as for the use of churches; and to perform that which his predecessor, Archbishop Cranmer, endeavoured so much to bring to pass, but could not (the bishops in his days being most of them utterly averse to any such thing), that is, that the bishops should join together and take their parts and portions in reviewing, amending, and setting forth the English translation of those holy books. This our present archbishop's thoughts ran much upon. And he had about this time distributed the Bible, divided into parts, to divers learned fellow-bishops, and to some other divines that were about him, who cheerfully undertook the work. As for the Bible commonly used, it was not only very ill printed, but the translation in many places bad, and such as gave offence; and the translator had followed Münster, who was very negligent, and mistook sometimes the Hebrew, as Bishop Sandys observed. The archbishop took upon him the labour to contrive and set the whole work a-going in a proper method, by sorting out the whole Bible into parcels to able bishops and other learned men to peruse, and collate each the book or books allotted them. Sending withal his instructions for the method they should observe; and they to add some short marginal notes for the illustration or correction of the text. And all these portions of the Bible being finished and sent back to the archbishop, he was to add the last hand to them, and so to take care for printing and publishing the whole."²

¹ Strype's *Life of Parker*, p. 208, London, 1711.

² *Life of Parker*, p. 207.

The coadjutors of the archbishop were not all equally competent, for Guest (Gheast), the Bishop of Rochester, confesses to some very peculiar convictions, which, if acted on, would have marred the integrity of the version. In reference to the Psalms, he says:¹ "I have not altered the translation, but where it gave occasion of an error. As at the first Psalm at the beginning I turn the præter-perfect tense into the present tense, because the sense is too harsh in the præter-perfect tense. Where in the New Testament one piece of a Psalm is reported, I translate it in the Psalms according to the translation thereof in the New Testament, for the avoiding of the offence that may rise to the people upon divers translations." Sandys, in another letter, Feb. 6th, writes more precisely: "According to your grace's letter of instruction, I have perused the book you sent me, and with good diligence; having also in conference with some other, considered of the same in such sort, I trust, as your grace will not mislike of. . . . I have sent it up with my clerk, whose hand I used in writing forth the corrections and marginal notes. When it shall please your grace to set over the book to be reviewed by some one of your chaplains, my clerk shall attend a day or two, to make it plain unto him how my notes are to be placed. In mine opinion your grace shall do well to make the whole Bible to be diligently surveyed by some well learned before it be put to print, and also to have skilful and diligent correctors at the printing of it, . . . which thing will require a time. Sed sat cito si sat bene." Bishop Cox, of Ely, who had no love for the men that made the Genevan version, expresses his deep interest in the project in a letter of May 3, 1566: "I trust your grace is well forward with the Bible by this time. I perceive the greatest burden will lie upon your neck, touching care and travail. I would wish that such usual words as we English people be acquainted with might still remain in their form and sound, so far forth as the Hebrew will well bear; ink-horn terms to be avoided. The translation of the verbs in the Psalms to be used uniformly in one tense."

¹ *Life of Parker*, p. 208.

The meaning of this last clause is not easily comprehended. Bishop Parkhurst, of Norwich, pledged himself "to travel therein with such diligence and expedition as he might." Davis, Bishop of St. David's, promised "to finish his part with as much speed as he could, bestowing upon the performance of the same all such time as he could spare."¹ On the 26th November, Parker also intimated the design to Cecil in the following terms: "I have distributed the Bible to divers men. I am desirous, if you could spare so much leisure either in morning or evening, we had one Epistle of St. Paul, St. Peter, or St. James perused by you, that ye may be one of the builders of this good work in Christ's Church." Another letter of the primate to Cecil, of date October 5th, 1568, encloses the short rules which the archbishop had laid down for the revisers—or, as he phrases it, "Observations respected of the translators."² "First, to follow the common English translation used in the churches, and not to recede from it, but where it varieth manifestly from the Hebrew or Greek original." "Item—To use sections and divisions in the text as Pagnine in his translation useth, and for the verity of the Hebrew to follow the said Pagnine and Münster specially, and generally others learned in the tongues." "Item—To make no bitter notes upon any text, or yet to set down any determination in places of controversy." "Item—To note such chapters and places as contain matter of genealogies, or other such places not edifying with some strike or note, that the reader may eschew them in his public reading." "Item—That all such words as sound in the old translation, to any offence of lightness or obscenity, be expressed with more convenient terms and phrases." Of the primate's coadjutors many were bishops, and this circumstance first gave its familiar name to the revision—the Bishops' Bible.

The actual workers cannot now be definitely named. The following is the list of the revisers of the several books inclosed

¹ Strype's *Life of Parker*, p. 208.

² Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D., p. 336, Parker Soc. ed.

in a letter to Cecil, of 5th October, 1568, and still remaining with it in the State Paper office:—

The sum of the Scripture	
The Tables of Christ's line	
The Argument of the Scriptures	M. Cant. [Archbishop Parker.]
The first Preface into the whole Bible	
The Preface into the Psalter	
The Preface into the New Testament	
Genesis	} M. Cant. [Archbishop Parker.]
Exodus	
Leviticus	} Cantuariæ. [Andrew Pierson, prebend of Canter-
Numerus	
Deuteronomium	} W. Exon. [Bishop Alley.]
Josue	
Judicum	} R. Meneven. [Bishop Davies.]
Ruth	
Regum, 1, 2.	
Regum, 3, 4.	
Paralipomenon, 1, 2.	} Ed. Wigorn. [Bishop Sandys.]
Job	
Proverbia	} Cantuariæ. [Andrew Pierson, prebend of Canter-
Ecclesiastes	
Cantica	} Cantabrigiæ. [Andrew Perne, Master of Peter-
Ecclesiasticus	
Susanna	} House, and Dean of Ely.]
Baruc	
Maccabeorum	
Esdras	} J. Norwic. [Bishop Parkhurst.]
Judith	
Tobias	} W. Cicestren. [Bishop Barlow.]
Sapientia	
Esaias	} R. Winton. [Bishop Horne.]
Hieremias	
Lamentationes	}
Ezechiel	
Daniel	} J. Lich. and Covent. [Bishop Bentham.]
Prophetæ	
minores	} Ed. London. [Bishop Grindal.]

Matthæus	} M. Cant. [Archbishop Parker.]	
Marcus		
Lucas	} Ed. Peterb. [Bishop Scambler.]	
Johannes		
Acta Apostolorum	} R. Eliensis. [Bishop Cox.]	
Ad Romanos . .		
1 Epistola Corin.	} D. Westmon. [Dr. Gabriel Goodman.]	
2 Epistola Corin.		
Ad Galatas . .	} M. Cant. [Archbishop Parker.]	
Ad Ephesios . .		
Ad Phillippenses		
Ad Collossenses .		
Ad Thessalon . .		
Ad Timotheum .		
Ad Titum . .		
Ad Philemon . .		
Ad Hebræos . .		
Epistolæ Canonice		
Apocalipsis	} N. Lincoln. [Bishop Bullingham.]	

But these names do not agree with the initials put at the end of some of the books, this notation being a suggestion of the archbishop, that the several revisers "might be the more diligent as answerable for their doings." But Lawrence, if he was a formal reviser, has no place marked by his initials, and the same initials stand at the end of Job and at the end of Proverbs. Still, as the archbishop suggested, "the letters of their names be partly affixed to their books." Some of the revisers may be made out by their initials as follows:—

The Pentateuch has W. E. (William Exoniensis), William Alley, Bishop of Exeter.

The next portion, up to the second book of Samuel, has R. M. (Ricardus Menevensis), Richard Davis, Bishop of St. Davids.

The third part, as far as second book of Chronicles, has E. W. (Edwin Wigornensis), Edwin Sandys.

The fourth portion, ending with Job, has A. P. C., Andrew Peerson, Prebendary of Canterbury.

The Psalms have T. B., probably Thomas Becon. This portion was first sent to Guest, Bishop of Rochester.

The Book of Proverbs is signed again A. P. C., supposed to be Andrew Peerson, Prebendary of Canterbury, the translator of the fourth portion.

The seventh portion, containing Ecclesiastes and Canticles, has A. P. E., Andrew Perne, Prebendary of Ely.

The eighth portion, ending with Lamentations, has R. W., Robert Horne, Bishop of Winchester.

The ninth part, Ezekiel and Daniel, has T. C. L., Thomas Cole, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry.

The tenth part, or minor prophets, has E. L., Edmund Grindal, Bishop of London.

The Apocrypha, or eleventh portion, has J. N., John Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich.

The Gospels and Acts have R. E., Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely.

The Epistle to the Romans has R. E., which, according to Strype, should be E. R., Edmund Guest, Bishop of Rochester.

The First Epistle to the Corinthians has G. G., Gabriel Goodman, Dean of Westminster.

The remaining books of the New Testament have no appended initials.¹

After a period of preparation extending to about four years, the archbishop, on 5th October, tells Cecil that the Bible is finished, and that he had thought of offering in person to the queen's highness "the first fruits of our labours in the recognizing the Bible," but, as his health would not allow him to "adventure," he asked the Secretary to present a copy to the queen, "bound as ye see." In a letter to her majesty of the same date his grace says—"Pleaseth it your highness to accept in good part the endeavour and diligence of some of us your chaplains, my brethren the bishops, with other certain learned men, in this new edition of the Bible. I trust by comparison of divers translations put forth in your realm, will

¹ Parker Correspondence, Parker Soc. ed., p. 334.

appear as well the workmanship of the printer, as the circumspection of all such as have travailed in the recognition. Among divers observations which have been regarded in this recognition, one was, not to make it vary much from that translation which was commonly used by public order, except where either the verity of the Hebrew and Greek moved alteration, or where the text was, by some negligence, mutilated from the original. So that I trust your loving subjects shall see good cause in your majesty's days to thank God and to rejoice, to see this high treasure of His holy word so set out as may be proved (so far forth as man's mortal knowledge can attain to, or as far forth as God hath hitherto revealed) to be faithfully handled in the vulgar tongue; beseeching your highness that it may have your gracious favour, licence, and protection, to be communicated abroad, as well for that in many churches they want their books, and have long time looked for this, as for that in certain places be publicly used some translations which have not been laboured in your realm, having inspersed diverse prejudicial notes, which might have been also well spared. I have been bold in the furniture with few words to express the incomparable value of this treasure."

The Bible so disparaged is the Genevan version and its famous notes; and the queen is earnestly appealed to that she might authorize the revision. In the same letter to Cecil, already referred to, the primate speaks on some technical points and matters of business:—

"It may be that in so long a work things have scaped, which may be lawful to every man, *cum bona venia*, to amend when they find them; *non omnia possumus omnes*. The printer hath honestly done his diligence; if your honour would obtain of the Queen's Highness that this edition might be licensed and only commended in public reading in churches, to draw to one uniformity, it were no great cost to the most parishes, and a relief to him for his great charges sustained.¹ The psalters might remain in quires, as

¹ In a "note" he adds, "The printer hath bestowed his thickest paper on the New Testament, because it shall be most occupied."

they be much multiplied, but where of their own accord they would use this translation. Sir, I pray your honour be a mean that Juggé only may have the preferment of this edition; for if any other should lurch him to steal from him these copies, he were a great loser in this first thing. And, sir, without doubt he hath well deserved to be preferred; a man would not think that he had devoured so much pain as he hath sustained."

It is pleasant to note that Parker was to his death on affectionate terms with his fellow-workers, and that he remembered some of them in his will. He bequeathed to Edmund Grindal, Archbishop of York, a gold ring with a round sapphire; to Edwin Sandys, Bishop of London, his staff of Indian cane, with silver gilt at the end; to Robert Horne, Bishop of Winchester, a gold ring with a turquoise; to Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely, his staff of Indian cane, with a horologe on the top; to Nicholas Bullingham, Bishop of Worcester, his white horse, called Hackengton, with the saddle, and bridle, and a new footcloth of velvet; to Andrew Pearson, B.D., a silver cup with a cover gilt, given to him by the queen on the feast of the circumcision.¹

¹ Coopers' Athenæ Cantabrigien- January, 1561-2, proposed a new ses, vol. I, p. 332. In the same translation of the Bible, and re-volume it is stated that Bishop Cox, peated the proposal in another in writing to Cecil on the 10th of letter of 3rd May, 1564. Do., p. 440.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

THE Bible was published in folio with the simple title: "The Holie Bible, containing the Old Testament and the New: The New Testament of our Saviour Jesus Christ. 1568. Richard Jugge. Cum Privilegio Regiæ Majestatis."

Jugge presents his "mark"—the pelican feeding her young with her own blood, with a Latin couplet explaining the symbol. The archbishop's own copy is in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. On the title-page, in an oval, is a half-length portrait of the queen, with the ball and sceptre in her hand; above her the arms of France and England quartered within the garter, and over them the helmet and crest. On the one side is the symbol of Ireland, and on the other that of Wales, while Charity and Faith are delineated on the margin of the picture. At the bottom of the page, on a scroll guarded by the lion and dragon, are the words, "Non me pudet Evangelii Christi. Virtus enim Dei est ad salutem omni credenti. Rom. i." At the beginning of Joshua is an engraving, in an oval, of the Earl of Leicester in armour, and his coat of arms is in the initial A of the word "AFTER." On the front of the Psalms is a plate of Lord Burleigh, holding in his left hand an open Hebrew book; and the initial D (David) of the Preface has in it his coat of arms, and also the B of the word "Blessed" in the first psalm. Parker's preface is in Roman, and Cranmer's prologue is in Gothic letters, the initial letter C of his name containing his coat of arms. There is also at Leviticus xviii a double table of degrees of "kinred, affinitie, or aliaunce which let matrimonise." The archbishop's paternal arms are found impaled with those of Christ Church Canterbury, in a

large initial T at the genealogical table in the Old Testament and at the preface to the New. There are many engravings. Otherwise the volume is marked by a severe simplicity, and there is no dedication.¹ Parker's preface inculcates the duty and privilege of reading the Scriptures, which are meant for all. The need of the present revision is also dwelt on. "And for that the copies thereof be so wasted, that very many churches do want their convenient Bybles, it was thought good to some well-disposed men, to recognize² the same Byble againe into this fourme as it is nowe come out, with some further diligence in the printing, and with more light added, partly in the translation, and partly in the order of the text; not as condemning the former translation, whiche was folowed mostly of any other translation, excepting the originall text, from whiche as litle variaunce was made as was thought meete to such as take paynes therin: desiring thee, good reader, if ought be escaped, eyther by such as had the expending of the bookes, or by the oversight of the printer, to correct the same in the spirite of Charitie, calling to remembrance what diversitie hath been seene in men's judgements in the translation of these bookes before these dayes, though all directed their labours to the glory of God, to the edification of the Church, to the comfort of their Christian brethren, and always as God dyd further open unto them, so ever more desirous they were to refourme their former humane oversights, rather then in a stubborne wyfulnessse to resist the gyft of the holy Ghost, who from tyme to tyme is resident as that heavenly teacher and leader into all truth, by whose direction the Church is ruled and governed." The misinterpretations of some Catholic writers are exposed, especially one which, in Rom. vi, 13, changed "sanctification" into "satisfaction." The saying of St. Augustine is quoted, "that divers translations many times have made the harder and darker sentences the more open and plain;" and Fisher, "once Bishop of Rochester," is also adduced as affirming that "many things have been more diligently

¹ Jewel wrote to Bullinger, "The which I certainly am not displeased." queen will not endure the title of ² It was the usual term then for Head of the Church of England, at "revise."

discussed, and more clearly understood by the writers of these latter days than in old times they were."

The division of verses adopted in the Genevan version is followed; and, after its example too, some care was taken of the spelling of proper names. But there is really no proof of Offor's¹ statement, that the New Testament of the Bishops' Bible is taken from a revision of Cheke's New Testament, published by Jugge in 1561. The Testament referred to by him is apparently an edition of Tyndale.²

One cannot surmise why the Queen should not have publicly acknowledged the appeal made to her by the Primate—why she should not have acted as her father had done to three translations, and given the version special recognition and sanction. Not even Parker's name graces the title-page, as Cranmer's had done in his Bible of 1540. Perhaps she had some regard for the Bible so often printed in her father's and brother's time, and for the memory of the primate who had at length died at the stake. At all events, no royal confirmation was given to the volume, and no license was issued, like that to John Bodleigh for the Genevan version. An edition of Cranmer's Bible was printed the same year as the first edition of the Bishops', and it bore upon it as usual, "according to the translation appointed to be read in churches"; but Parker's Bible never carried such a mandate during his lifetime. In the royal patents for printing the Bible, no version was singled out for preference, even though such patents were sanctioned by Archbishop Whitgift. Not till 1577 was an edition printed "set forth by authoritie"—that is, not royal, only episcopal authority; but, as if to offer a counterpoise, a copy of the Genevan of the same year was presented to the "throned vestal," and the covers were embroidered by her own hand.

But Convocation naturally made special enactments in favour of the Bishops' version. In the "Constitutions and Canons" of 1571, it was ordered "that every archbishop and bishop should have at his house a copy of the Holy Bible of the largest volume, as lately printed in London, and that it should be placed in the

¹ Offor MSS., II, British Museum. in his own collection, pp. 185-187.

² Lea Wilson's Catalogue of Bibles Cotton's Editions, &c., p. 32.

hall or large dining room, that it might be useful to their servants or to strangers"—the order applying also to each cathedral, and "so far as could be conveniently done, to all the churches." The English service was still very unwelcome to many of the conservative clergy and nobility, who regarded it as the life of the religious revolution by which so many intolerable changes were wrought round about them. The rebellion of the northern Earls in 1569 had, according to their proclamation, for its object "to restore all ancient customs and liberties to God and this noble realm." The insurgents, filled with this spirit, entered Durham Cathedral with the old banner of the Pilgrimage borne before them, blazoned with the cross, the streamers, and the five wounds, and at once destroyed "the English Bibles,"¹—copies, in all probability, of the Great Bible.

In the Old Testament the Great Bible was chiefly followed; many chapters exhibit few important variations, and numerous better renderings introduced by the Genevan version are ignored, though not a few emendations are at the same time adopted from it. Canon Westcott says, "It is possible that I may have been unfortunate in the parts which I have examined (of the Old Testament), for what I saw did not encourage me to compare very much of the Bishops' text with the other versions."² Editions of the version appeared in 1569, 1570, and 1571.

Strype has preserved some critical remarks on twenty-nine places of the New Testament of the Bishops' Bible, by Lawrence—"a man, in those days, of great fame for his knowledge of the Greek," and probably one of the revisers of the Bishops' version, or suggesters of the second edition.³ Lawrence was probably the head-master of Shrewsbury School, and the instructor in Greek of Lady Cecil, who became a wonderful proficient in that language. The criticisms are certainly made on some places in the New Testament of the first edition of the Bishops' Bible, for it alone of all the versions contains several of the clauses on which critical comments are given, though the majority of them are found also in the Great Bible, on

¹ Froude's History, vol. IX, p. 315.

³ Life of Parker. Appendix, No.

² History, p. 247, 2nd ed.

lxxxv, p. 139.

which the Bishops' was principally based. In some instances the rendering of the Great Bible is simply restored. The verses selected for emendation are, with one exception, taken from the Synoptical Gospels, and his corrections were accepted in the revised edition of the Bishops', published in 1572; probably, therefore, the work of Lawrence was done with a view to this edition, and was intended to present a brief specimen of the necessity and nature of a good revision.

Lawrence's first section is headed "Wordes not aptlye translated in the New Testament." His proposed emendations are—Matt. xvii, 27,²⁸ instead of "of the children," B. 1, "their children," G. B., "of their own children," adopted in the B. 2 and A.;² but the best Greek reading will not warrant it. 27, instead of "cast an angle," G. B., B. 1, "cast an hook," adopted in B. 2, and A. xxi, 33, instead of "made a vineyard," B. 1 and G. B., "planted a vineyard," "amended" in the Genevan, adopted in B. 2 and A. 38, instead of "let us enjoy it," B. 1, G. B., "let us take possession or seizyn," adopted virtually in B. 2 and A.; "keep," however, would be more literal. xxii, 7, instead of "sente forth his men of war," B. 1, G. B., "sent forth his armies," adopted in B. 2 and A. xxv, 20, instead of "five talents more," B. 1, G. B., "five talents besides," B. 2 and A. xxvi, 38, instead of "is heavy," B. 1, G. B., "is exceedinge heavie," adopted in B. 2 and A., as the adjective is a strong compound; the Genevan having "very heavie." 42, instead of "he went awaie once again," B. 1, G. B., "he went away the second time," noting that "this is amended in the Genevan Bible," adopted in B. 2 and A. xxvii, 14, instead of "harmless," B. 1, G. B., "careless"; "this is not considered in the Genevan Bible"; adopted in B. 2 and A. as "secure you," make you secure—that is, free from care, if judicial investigation should take place.

Mark i, 24, "let us alone," the clause not being in B. 1 and G. B., adopted in B. 2 and A.; but the Greek reading that would warrant such a translation can scarcely be sustained. 45, instead of "to tell many things," B. 1, G. B. "openly to declare,"

² B. 1, Bishops' first edition; B. 2, Bishops' revised edition of 1572; G. B., Great Bible; A., Authorized.

virtually B. 2 and A.; but it is "not considered in the Genevan Bible." x, 19, instead of "thou shalte not kyll," B. 1, "kyll not," G. B., "doe not kyll," B. 2 and A., Beza being correct in those places, but the Genevan wrong; and the "Vulgate" being right in this verse, but wrong in rendering the same language in Luke xviii, 20. xii, 15, instead of "seeing," B. 1, "having understood their dissimulation," G. B., "he knowinge theire hypocrisie," B. 2, but not A.

In Luke i, 3, 4, the translation of the Great Bible is really better than that which Lawrence suggests, and which is found in the Bishops', and virtually in the Authorized, "having perfect understanding of all things from the beginning," the Great Bible having "as soon as I had searched out diligently all things"—the correct rendering being "having traced the course of all things accurately from the first"; Lawrence is right in the last clause, "whereof thou hast been taught by mouth," adopted in the B. 2, but refused in A. vi, 44, instead of "nor of bushes," B. 1, G. B., "nor of a bramble-bush," B. 2 and A. All those corrections suggested by Lawrence have been adopted in the Bishops', and, with one exception, are found also in the Authorized.

Lawrence's second section is headed "Wordes and pieces of sentences omytted." Some of the instances imply a different Greek reading, and in others the omission is the fault of the translator. He notices "yet" omitted in Matt. xv, 16, B. 1 and G. B., amended in the Genevan, found in B. 2 and A. xxii, 13, "take him up" "take" omitted in B. 1, not in G. B., but inserted in B. 2 and A. xxvi, 13, "whole," in the phrase "whole world," omitted in G. B., B. 1 having "al the world," but given in B. 2 and A.

Mark xv, 3, "but he answered nothing," B. 1, G. B.; the omission also in Beza, and therefore in the Genevan; but inserted in B. 2 and A. after the margin of Stephens. The clause, however, has no authority, being taken from Matt. xxvii, 12, or Luke xxiii, 9.

Luke viii, 23, "of wind," in G. B., not B. 1; inserted in B. 2 and A. In x, 22, Lawrence commends the insertion of "and turning to his disciples he said," G. B., not B. 1, but the clause was not

adopted by B. 2; the Genevan admitted it, though it is not in the text of Beza; but Stephens had adopted it. It had been rejected by Erasmus; Tyndale and Coverdale also omit it; and it is placed in the margin of the Authorized Version, with a note. xxii, 12, "great" is omitted, B. 1, the clause ought to be "a great upper chamber," the reading of Stephens and Beza, and the Genevan accepted in B. 2 and A. "A great parlour paved" is the rendering of Tyndale and Coverdale, and of the Great Bible of 1539 and 1540; the Genevan having "a great hie chamber trimmed." The last example is xxiv, 27, "he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures which were written of him," B. 1, G. B., the rendering being liable to misinterpretation, and the sense being he "interpreted to them in all the Scriptures those things which were written of him," "well amended in the Genevan translation"; accepted by B. 2, but more compact in A.—"he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."

Lawrence's third head is "Wordes superfluous," and his examples are, Mark xiii, 16, "Let hym that is in the felde not turne backe againe unto the thinges whiche he lefte behinde him," B. 1, G. B., the proper rendering being briefer, "let him not turne backe," adopted by B. 2 and A. Luke xii, 24, "feathered fowles," B. 1, G. B. within brackets. Lawrence asks "what needethe feathered?" the epithet perhaps suggested by the "volucibus" of Erasmus; omitted in B. 2 and A.

The fourth section refers to "Sentences changed and error in doctrine." Luke ix, 45, "it was hidde from them, that they understoode it not," B. 1, G. B., should be "it was hidde from them that they should not understand it," rightly adopted in B. 2, but vailed in A., and it had been refused by the Genevan, though it quadrated with Genevan theology. Colos. ii, 13, "dead to synne, and to the uncircumcision of your flesh," B. 1, G. B. having "through . . . through"; it should be "dead in synne"; the necessary change was adopted in the subsequent versions.

The last section is "Modes and tenses changed, and places not well considered by Theodorus Beza and Erasmus, as I

thynke." Matt. xxi, 3, "say ye," B. 1, G. B., should be "ye shall say,"—Beza having "dicite," but *ἐπεῖτε* is never of the imperative mood and Beza has "dicetis" in other places; the correction is adopted by B. 2 and A. Luke xvii, 8, for "eate thou and drynke thou," B. 1, G. B., "thou shalt eate and drynke," "for the sense it maketh no great matter, but in grammar it is an evident error." The future is in Coverdale's own version, but the imperative "eat thou" was put into the Great Bible after Tyndale, and it was taken also by the Genevan. This correction is followed by a long grammatical argument against Erasmus and Beza, who, misled by the form of the verbs, took them for first aorist imperatives. B. 2 and A. rightly adopt the future, though Beza had *edito tu et bibito*. These remarks are not all of primary importance, but they indicate scholarship, and have influenced our present Bibles. The modest critic adds: "It is more lyke that I should be deceived than either Erasmus or Beza. I wolde gladlye they were defended that I might see myne own error. I take them to be deceyved, because I see reason and auctoritie for me, and as yet none for them, but because they saye so, and yet brynge no prooffe for them." Had Lawrence extended his remarks to the Great Bible, he might have corrected many blunders; for in the Great Bible sometimes the translation does not bring out the full meaning of the original, sometimes it goes beyond it, and occasionally it is erroneous: as Luke ii, 13, "a multitude of heavenly soudyers"; xvi, 8, the word lord is spelled "Lord" with an initial capital, as if it referred to Jesus, and the clause were his eulogy of dishonesty; and "in their nation" of the same verse is a misrendering, as is xix, 23, "with vauntage"; John i, 1, "and God was the Word"; 3, "all things were made by it"; Acts viii, 23, "full of bitter gall"; 26, "which is in the desert"; xxvii, 9, "because also that they had overlong fasted"; 13, "loosed into Asson," making the adverb a proper name; Rom. ix, 5, "which is God in all things to be praised"; xii, 11, "apply yourselves to the time." Many of those instances occur also in the earlier versions.¹

¹ See vol. I, pp. 142, 381, &c.

The special edition of 1572 was revised in the New Testament, and in many places corrected and improved. It is printed on thick paper, and is a heavy and handsome folio. Of titles, portraits, and maps, it has only thirty engravings, and the initial letter of Jeremiah has in it a coat of arms. But it was disfigured by several peculiar ornaments, or ornamental initial letters, taken from Ovid's "Metamorphoses," such as Leda and the Swan at the Epistle to the Hebrews, with many others of a similar incongruous character. It has a double copy of the Psalms—one column in the page preserves the version of the Great Bible in black letter, and the other, or parallel column, the new version in Roman letter. The nature of the revision in the New Testament may be seen in the following collation of the Epistle to the Galatians. The revision is careful, and shows a decided desire and effort towards an exacter and more literal version. The New Testament of Tyndale is imbedded in the Great Bible, and shows itself in the first edition of the Bishops'; but the revised edition of the Bishops', in its independent course, occasionally differs from it. Expletive words are placed in brackets; and honest scholarship is everywhere apparent.

FIRST EDITION, 1568.

REVISED EDITION, 1572.

CHAPTER I.

Verse

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1 raised him up from death; Great Bible, Tyndale. | from the dead; Genevan. |
| 9 than that ye have received. | [that ye have]. |
| 10 If I should yet please men; Genevan. | If I yet pleased men. |
| 11 was not after men; Genevan. | is not after men. |
| 13 howe that; Genevan, Tyndale. | [how] that. |
| 15 called me. | called [me]. |
| 17 neither returned; Tyndale. | went I up. |
| which were apostles. | which [were]. |
| 18 I returned to Jerusalem. | I went up. |
| 23 in time past; Genevan, Great Bible, Tyndale. | in times past. |

FIRST EDITION, 1568.

REVISED EDITION, 1572.

CHAPTER II.

Verse

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 2 I went up also; Great Bible. | I went up; Genevan. |
| which were the chiefe; Genevan. | which were esteemed the chief. |
| 6 in time passed; Genevan, Great Bible, Tyndale. | in times past. |
| 9 then James; Great Bible, Tyndale. | [then] James. |
| 12 which were. | [which were]. |
| 14 why causest thou? Great Bible, Tyndale. | why compellest thou? |
| 16 and we have believed; Great Bible. | we have believed. |
| 21 comme of the law; Great Bible, Tyndale. | [come]. |

CHAPTER III.

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1 described before the eyes; Great Bible, Tyndale. | was before described before the eyes. |
| 19 till the seed came; Great Bible. | should come. |

CHAPTER IV.

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 12 be ye as I [am]. | for I [am] as ye are. |
| 25 which is nowe [called] Jerusalem. | which [is] now [called]. |
| 30 shall not be heir; Great Bible, Tyndale. | shall in no wise be heyre. |

CHAPTER V.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 8 not the perfection of hym that called you. | this perswasion cometh not of him that called you. |
| 9 a little leaven doth leaven. | leaveneth. |
| 14 which is this; Genevan, Great Bible. | [which is this]. |
| 20 zeal. | emulations; Genevan. |
| 21 that they. | that [even] Christes. |
| 24 they truly that are; Great Bible. | that [are] have. |
| 25 let us walk; Great Bible, Tyndale. | let us also walk in the Spirit; Genevan. |

CHAPTER VI.

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1 be taken in any fault; Great Bible. | be prevented in any fault. |
| considering thyself, lest. | considering thee selfe, lest. |
| 3 in his own fansie. | in his own fantasy. |
| 8 into his flesh. | in his fleashe; Great Bible, Tyndale. |
| 13 rejoyce in your flesh; Genevan, Great Bible, Tyndale. | glory in your flesh. |
| 14 should rejoyce, but in; Great Bible, Genevan, Tyndale. | should glory, but in the cross. |

The Historical Books of the Old Testament are not much changed, the revision is slight and superficial, and the words and phrases of the Great Bible are so continuously employed as almost to take independent character from the version. Thus in the first twenty verses of Genesis xxxvii, there are some twelve changes, none of any great importance, but nearly all of them bringing the English into closer uniformity with the Hebrew. The revisers were enjoined to follow Pagninus and Münster,* though the last was depreciated unjustly by Sandys, and they obeyed the injunction.

GREAT BIBLE.	BISHOPS'.
Verse	
2 an euyl sayinge of them.	their evil <i>report</i> . ¹
7 and youres stode.	and <i>behold</i> ² your sheaves.
8 be our kynge in dede.	a king indeed <i>on us</i> ³ (over us, 1572).
10 come to fall on the grounde before thee.	indeed come to <i>bow to thee</i> . ⁴
11 hated him. ⁵	<i>envied</i> ⁶ him, Genevan.
12 kepe their fathers shepe. ⁷	his fathers <i>cattel</i> , ⁸ and so in verses 14 and 16.
14 he went to.	<i>came to</i> . ⁹
19 this dreamer. ¹⁰	this notable dreamer; marginal note — Hebrew, maister of dreames.
20 a wycked beast.	some naughtie beaste. ¹¹

¹ Malam famam eorum, Pagninus, Münster, Leo Judæ.

² Et ecce, Pagninus.

³ Super nos, Pagninus, Münster, Leo Judæ.

⁴ Und dich anbeten, Luther.

⁵ Virtually Leo Judæ.

⁶ Inuidebant, Vulgate.

⁷ Coverdale ("their fathers" of the Great Bible being correct); oves, Münster.

⁸ Grex, Leo Judæ; pecudes, Pagninus.

⁹ Venit, Pagninus.

¹⁰ Somniator ille, Pagninus.

¹¹ Bestia mala, Münster.

* It is one of the signs of those changing times that Sebastian Münster, whose Latin translation is so cordially recommended by Archbishop Parkert to his coadjutors, published in 1527 a *Hebrew Dictionary*, to which he prefixed an elaborate dedication to Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, whom King Henry VIII beheaded in 1535.

Or take the Great Bible, the Genevan, and the Bishops':—

EZEKIEL XXXVII.

GREAT BIBLE.	GENEVAN.	BISHOPS'.
1 The hand of the Lord came ¹ vpon me, and caried me out in the sprete of the Lorde, and let me ² downe in a playne field that lay full of bones. ³	The hand of the Lord was ⁴ vpon me, and caried me out in the Spirit of the Lord, and set me downe in the <i>middles</i> of a field which was ful of bones.	The hande of the Lorde was vpon me, and caried me out in the spirite of the Lorde, and set me downe in the <i>midst</i> of a <i>plaine</i> field that was full of bones.
2 And he led me rounde about by them, and beholde ⁷ the bones that lay vpon the field were very many, and maruelous ⁹ drye also.	And he led me round about by them, and beholde there were very manie in the <i>open</i> ¹⁰ field, and, lo, they were verie drye.	And he led me rounde about by them, and beholde, there were very many in the open field, and lo ¹¹ (they were) very drye.
3 Then ¹² sayde he vnto me: Thou ¹³ sonne of man: thinkest ¹⁴ thou that these bones may liue again, ¹⁵ I answered, O Lord God, thou knowest.	And ¹⁶ he said vnto me, Sonne of man, can these bones liue? And ¹⁷ I answered, O Lord God, thou knowest.	Then ¹⁸ saide he vnto me: Thou sonne of man, thinkest thou these bones may liue againe: I answered, O Lorde God, thou knowest.
4 And he sayd vnto me: Prophecie thou vpon ¹⁹ these bones: and speake vnto them. Ye drye bones, heare the worde of the Lorde.	Again he said vnto me, Prophecie vpon ²⁰ these bones, and say vnto them, O ye drye bones, heare the worde of the Lorde.	And he said vnto me, Prophecie thou vpon these bones, and speake vnto them: Ye drye bones, heare the worde of the Lorde. ²¹

¹ Kam, Luther, Zürich.

² Liess, Zürich.

³ Das lag voller gebeins, Zürich.

⁴ Fuit, Pagninus.

⁵ In medio, Vulgate.

⁶ In medio planicie, Münster.

⁷ Sehe, Luther.

⁸ Des gebeynes, Zürich.

⁹ Vast dürr, Zürich.

¹⁰ In superficie agri, Pagninus.

¹¹ Ecce, Pagninus, Münster.

This interjection is expressed in the Hebrew twice.

¹² Do, rendered then by Coverdale.

¹³ Du, Luther.

¹⁴ Putasne, Vulgate.

¹⁵ Wieder, Zürich.

¹⁶ Et, Vulgate and Latin versions.

¹⁷ Et, Münster, Pagninus.

¹⁸ Tum, Leo Judæ—

the verse corresponds with the Great Bible.

¹⁹ Über, Zürich, Coverdale.

²⁰ Super, Pagninus and Münster, after the Hebrew.

²¹ After the Great Bible.

EZEKIEL XXXVII—CONTINUED.

GREAT BIBLE.

5 Thus sayth the Lord God vnto these bones, Behold I will put breath into you, *that*¹ ye may lyue:

6 I will geue you *sin-owes*,⁴ and *make fleshe to growe vpon you*,⁵ and couer you ouer with skynne; and so geue you breath, *that*⁶ ye may lyue, and knowe that I am the Lord God.

7. So¹⁰ I prophecied, as *he commanded*¹¹ me, and as I was prophecying ther came a noyse and a great mocion so that the bones came euerye one to another.¹²

8 Now when I had loked, *behold*¹⁹ they had sinowes, and fleshe grewe vpon theym: and *aboue*²⁰ they were couered with skynne, but there was no breath in theym.

¹ Das, Luther, Zürich, Coverdale.

² Introire facio—Pagninus; the Hebrew verb being in the Hiphil conjugation.

³ After the Great Bible and the Genevan.

⁴ Nervos, Vulgate.

⁵ Increscere faciam carnes, Vulgate.

⁶ Das, Luther and Zürich.

GENEVAN.

Thus saith the Lord God vnto these bones, Beholde *I wil cause*² breath to entre into you and ye shal liue.

And I wil lay sinewes *vpon*⁷ you, and make flesh growe vpon you, and couer you with skin, and put breath in you, *that ye may liue, and ye shal*⁸ knowe that I am the Lord.

So I prophecied as *I was*¹³ *commanded*: and as I prophecied, there was a *noyse*¹⁴ and beholde there *was*¹⁵ *a shaking* and the bones *came*¹⁶ *together*, *bone to his bone*.¹⁷

And when I behelde, lo, the sinewes, and the fleshe grewe vpon them, and *aboue* the skin couered them, but there was no breath in them.

⁷ Super vos, Vulgate, Münster.

⁸ Und sollt erfahren, Luther.

⁹ After the Great Bible.

¹⁰ Do, Zürich.

¹¹ Sicut præceperat mihi, Vulgate.

¹² Zu dem andern, Zürich.

¹³ Jussus fui, Pagninus, Münster,

BISHOPS'.

Thus saith the Lorde God vnto these bones: Beholde, I wyll cause breath to enter into you that ye may lyue.³

I wyll geue you *sinowes*, and make fleshe growe vpon you, and couer you ouer with skinne, and so geue you breath, that ye may liue, and knowe that I am the Lorde.⁹

So I prophecied as *I was*¹⁸ *commanded*: and as I was prophecying there was a noyse, and also a great motion so that the bones came neare together, bone to his bone.

Now when I had loked, behold they had sinowes, and fleshe grewe vpon them, and above they were couered with skin, but there was no breath in them.²¹

¹⁴ Sonus, Leo Judæ.

¹⁵ Et ecce strepitus, Münster; et ecce comotio, Pagninus.

¹⁶ Accesserunt.

¹⁷ Os scilicet ad os suum, Münster.

¹⁸ After the Genevan.

¹⁹ Ecce, Pagninus.

²⁰ Desuper, do.

²¹ After the Great Bible.

EZEKIEL XXXVII—CONTINUED.

GREAT BIBLE.

9 Then sayd hee vnto mee, Thou sonne of man, propheseye thus *towarde*¹ the wynde: propheseye and speake to the wynde: Thus saith the Lord God, Come (O thou ayre) from the foure wyndes, and blowe vpon these slayne that they may be *restored to lyfe*.³

10 So I prophecied as he had commaunded me: *then*⁶ came the breth vnto theym, and they receaued lyfe, and stode op vpon their fete, a *maruelous great*⁷ *sorte*.

GENEVAN.

Then said he vnto me, Prophecievnto thewinde: prophecie, sonne of man, and say to the winde, and say to the winde, Thus saith the Lord God,³ Come from the foure windes, O breath, and breathe vpon these slaine, *that*⁴ they may liue.

So I prophecied as he had commanded me: and thebreathcameinto them, and they liued, and stode op vpon their fete, *an exceeding*⁸ *great armie*.

BISHOPS'.

Then said he vnto me: Thou sonne of man, prophecie thou towarde the winde, prophecie and speake to the winde, thus saith the Lord God: Come, O thou *ayre*,⁵ from the foure windes, and blowe vpon these slaine that they may lyue.

So I prophecied as he had commaunded me: then came the breath into them; and they receaued lyfe, and stoode vp vpon their feete, a marueilous great armie.⁹

The Apocrypha is scarcely revised at all, and neglecting the Genevan, it reverts mainly to the Great Bible which is usually followed, and which rests on the Latin text. The prayer of Manasses is restored to the place which it occupied between the story of Bel and the Dragon and the First Book of Maccabees.

MATTHEW III.

GREAT BIBLE.

1. In those dayes came John ye Baptist, *preaching*¹⁰ in the wilderness of Jewrie, *saying*,¹¹

¹ Gegen, Zürich, Coverdale.

² Reviviscant, Vulgate; wieder lebendig, Luther, Coverdale.

³ Order as in the Vulgate.

⁴ Das, Luther; ut, Münster and Leo Judæ.

⁵ Lufft, Luther, and Coverdale.

GENEVAN.

*And*¹² in those dayes John the Baptiste came and *preached*¹³ in the wilderness of Judea.

⁶ Do, Zürich.

⁷ Träffentliche grosse Menge, Zürich.

⁸ Exercitus grandis valde valde—Pagninus; au attempt to reproduce the Hebrew duplication of the adverb.

⁹ After the Great Bible.

¹⁰ Predicans, Vulgate.

BISHOPS'.

In those dayes came¹⁴ John the Baptist preaching in the wyldernesse of Jurie.

¹¹ Dicens, Vulgate and Erasmus.

¹² Autem, Vulgate, Beza.

¹³ Tyndale, Coverdale; und predigte, Luther and the Zurich.

¹⁴ All the versions misrender the present—"came" instead of "cometh."

MATTHEW III—CONTINUED.

GREAT BIBLE.

2 Repent of the life¹ that is past, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand.

3 For this is he of whom⁴ the prophet Esaias spake, which saith,⁵ The voice of a cryer⁶ in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lorde: and make his pathes straight.

4 This¹¹ John had his raiment of cammels heare. And a girdell of askinne about hys loynes. His meate was locustes and wilde hony.

5 Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Jewrie, and all the region rounde about Jordan.¹⁶

6 And were baptized of him in Jordane, confessing their sinnes.¹⁸

7 But¹⁹ when he saw many of the Pharises and Saduces come to his bap-

GENEVAN.

And said, Repent:² for the kingdome of heaven is at hand.

For⁷ this is he of whome it is spoken⁸ by the Prophet Esaias, saying,⁹ The voyce of him that cryeth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord: make his paths straight.

And¹² this John had his garment of camels heere, and a girdle of a skin about hys loynes: his meat was also¹³ locustes and wilde honie.

Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea,¹⁷ and all the region rounde about Jordan.

And they were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sinnes.

Now when he saw many of the Pharises and of the Sadduces come to his bap-

BISHOPS'.

And saying, Repent ye,³ for the kingdome of heaven is at hand.

For this is he that was spoken of by the prophete Esaias, saying, the voyce of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lorde, make ye his pathes straight.¹⁰

This John had his raiment of camels heare, and a letherne girdle¹⁴ about his loines,¹⁵ his meate was locustes and wild honey.

Then went out to him Hierusalem, and all Jurie, and al the region rounde about Jordane.

And were baptised of him in Jordane, confessing their sinnes.

But when he sawe many of the Pharisees and Saducees comme to

¹ Vitæ prioris, Erasmus.

² Resipiscite, Beza.

³ The pronoun "ye" not in the two previous versions, but inserted in the Authorized Version.

⁴ De quo dixit, Erasmus.

⁵ Qui ait, Erasmus.

⁶ Tyndale, Coverdale.

⁷ Nam, Beza.

⁸ De quo dictum, Beza, Leo Judæ.

⁹ Dicentem, Vulgate.

¹⁰ Repeated verbatim in the Authorized Version—the variation from the previous versions being an improvement.

¹¹ Ipse vero, Erasmus.

¹² Ipse vero, Beza.

¹³ Alimentum autem ejus, Beza.

¹⁴ Luther and Zürich; kept in the Authorized Version.

¹⁵ All these versions omit the connecting particle "and" (et).

¹⁶ Tyndale throughout.

¹⁷ Tota Judæa, Beza.

¹⁸ Tyndale.

¹⁹ Autem, Vulgate; also nnn, Luther and Zürich.

MATTHEW III—CONTINUED.

GREAT BIBLE.

tisme, hee said unto them. O generacion of vipers, who hath taught¹ you to flee from the vengeance to come.

8 Bring forth the fruites that be long to repentance.

9 And be⁷ not of such minde that ye would say within your selves: we have Abraham to our father. For I say unto you that God is able to bring⁸ to passe, that of these stones there shall⁹ rise up children unto Abraham.

10 Even¹³ now is the axe also put unto the roote of the trees: so that¹⁴ every tre which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewen downe and cast into the fyre.

11 I baptize you with water unto repentance:

GENEVAN.

tisme, he said unto them, O generacions² of vipers, who hathe forewarned³ you to flee from the angrer to come.

Bring forth the fruites worthy amendment⁴ of life.⁵

And¹⁰ thinke not to say with¹¹ your selves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.

And now also¹⁵ is the axe put to the roote of the trees: therefore¹⁶ everie tre which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewen downe and cast into the fyre.

Indeede¹⁷ I baptize you with water to amendment

BISHOPS'.

his baptisme, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the angrer to come.

Bring forth the fruites meete⁶ for repentance.

And be not of such minde, that ye would say within your selves, We have Abraham to (our)¹² father; For I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.

Even now is the axe also put into the roote of the trees: Wherefore, every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewen downe and cast into the fire.

I baptize you in¹⁸ water unto repentance: but he

¹ Werhateuch gewiesen, Luther.

² Plural in both German versions.

³ Præmonstravit, Beza.

⁴ Dignum iis qui resipuerint, Beza.

⁵ This rendering suggested the marginal note in the Authorized Version, "answerable to amendment of life."

⁶ Qui decent penitentiam, Erasmus.

⁷ Virtually after Luther; ne sitis hac mente, Erasmus, kept in the Bishops'.

⁸ Quod possit Deus facere, Erasmus.

⁹ Ut filii surgant, Erasmus.

¹⁰ Ne putetis, Beza.

¹¹ Apud, Beza, kept in the Authorized Version.

¹² "Our" is really carried by the idiom, though printed in italics

in the Authorized Version.

¹³ Jam vero, Erasmus.

¹⁴ Darumb, Zürich.

¹⁵ Correct rendering of the Greek, and preserved in the Authorized Version.

¹⁶ Igitur, Beza.

¹⁷ Quidem, Beza.

¹⁸ Tyndale; but he does not preserve uniformity in the last clauses.

MATTHEW III—CONTINUED.

GREAT BIBLE.	GENEVAN.	BISHOPS'.
but hee that <i>shall</i> ¹ come after mee, is mightier than I, whose shooes I am not worthy to beare. Hee shall baptize you with the holye ghost and with ² fyre.	of life, but he <i>that cometh</i> ³ after me is mightier then I, whose shoes I am not worthie to beare: he will baptize you with the holie Gost and with fyre.	that cometh after me is mightier then I, whose shoes I am not woorthy to beare, he shall baptize you with the holye ghost and with ⁴ fyre.

12 Whose fan is in his hande, and he will purge hys floore, and <i>gather</i> ⁵ his ⁶ wheate into the barne, but will burne the chaffe wyth unquenecheable fire.	Which hathe his fanne in his hand, and wil make cleane <i>his floore</i> , ⁷ and gather his wheat into his garner, but wil <i>burn up</i> ⁸ the chaffe with unquenecheable fire.	Whose fanne is in his hand, and he wil <i>thoroughly</i> ⁹ purge his floore, and gather his wheate into (his) garner: but wil burne up the chaffe with unquenecheable fire.
--	--	--

In the 8th chapter of Romans, the Bishops' has, in verse 3, "through the flesh," the Great Bible and the Genevan having "because of the flesh," but it gives us "joint-heirs" and "earnest expectation"; while the Great Bible interpolates a verb in verse 3, "that performed God"; and the Genevan inserts "to death" in 32. But the Genevan gives us "more than conquerors," the other two having only "overcome"; and the Genevan also brought in "the redemption of our body." To the Bishops' we owe the expressive and familiar phrases in Ephesians ii, 14, "middle wall"; 19, "fellow-citizens"; and iii, 8, "less than the least."

Though the Bishops' was thus professedly a revision of the Great Bible, the marginal notes in the New Testament are often from the Genevan, though Parker, in his letter to the queen,

¹ Venturus est, Erasmus, Vulgate.	in italics, but it should be omitted.	⁹ Perpurgabit, Beza. The second "his" bracketed, though the clause with the article distinctly bears it, but it is omitted in the Authorized Version.
² "Mit" repeated in Luther, Zürich, Coverdale, Tyndale.	⁵ Sammeln, Luther.	
³ Qui venit, Beza.	⁶ Triticum suum, Erasmus.	
⁴ Authorized Version prints second "with"	⁷ Aream suam, Erasmus, Beza.	
	⁸ Exuret, Erasmus, Beza.	

had disparaged them as "prejudicial, and that might have well been spared." Could they be inserted without his knowledge? Was not he the last or editorial reviser?¹ Yet in the Epistle to the Philippians, all the annotations but one are from the Genevan; and of more than fifty notes on 1 Corinthians there are only seven not reprinted from the same version. The original marginal notes, which are unevenly distributed, are not nearly so numerous as those of the Genevan version. They are often trite inferences, as at Genesis i, 7, "It is the power of God that holdeth up the clouds"; 14, "These lights were not made to serve astronomers' phantasies"; ii, 19, "Man showed himself lord of the beasts by giving them names." Sometimes the notes are doctrinal, as Gen. i, 26, "One God and thre persons"; Deut. vii, 12, "This covenant is grounded on his free grace; therefore in recompensing their obedience he hath respect unto his mercy, and not to their merits." Other notes, beginning with "that is," turn attention to the statement of the text. Some are hortatory and practical, as Luke xvi, 31, "We must seek for truth in God's Word, and not of the dead," and state in a clause what the contents of the paragraph are. Some, beginning with "or," or "some read," give alternative renderings; others are explanatory, as Luke i, 73, "the oath which he sware," which is "that he would give himself to us." Many are historical and geographical, and occasionally the original term is explained or handled, as twice in Rom. viii, and in both verses, 15 and 18, the rendering and sense of the Genevan are directly opposed; Luke iv, 29, "Top of the hill (Greek readeth 'brow of the hill')." Lastly, some notes are explanatory of words in the text, as in Isaiah, "Burden—that is prophecy"; in Ephesians, "mystery is that secret hidden purpose of salvation"; Acts xxviii, 11, "Castor and Pollux—these the Paynims feigned to be Jupiter's chyl dren, gods of the sea."

Archaic terms occur: Gen. xxxii, 25, "He smote him upon the hucklebone of his thigh." Isaiah lxvi, 3, "He that killeth a sheep for me knetcheth a dog (margin, that is, cutteth off a dogge's necke)," Coverdale having "choketh a

¹ See page 29 for other examples.

dog." They describe "concision" in the margin, Philip. iii, 2, as "they who craked thereof," "dogges" of v. 2 being explained as they that "bark against the true doctrine." The Ballet of Ballets of Solomon is accompanied by a Messianic exegesis, and so are the Prophets.

Burleigh's portrait stands, as we have said, at the beginning of the Psalter, and the story goes that, in rebuking the Earl of Essex for some of his turbulent schemes, he pointed him directly and solemnly to Psalm lv, 23, 24, "The bloodthirstie and deceitfull men shall not live out halfe their dayes."

The Bible of 1575—the year of Archbishop Parker's death—bears on the separate issues of the same edition the names of various publishers—as Kele, Wally, Judson, Norton, Harrison; and to these names, given by Anderson, may be added Coldock. Two of these men had already borne a part in the joint-publication of Matthew's Bible of 1551. Mr. Anderson, who had a more than healthy detestation of monopolists, appears rather glad to suspect that Jugge was really unable to bear more than a share in this large enterprise.¹

We learn incidentally the price of this Bible from an old account book of St. John's College, Cambridge, which has the following entry:—"1571, For a new Bible in English, the last translation, 27s. 8d."²

¹ Annals, vol. II, p. 335; Cotton, p. 39.

² Cotton, Editions, p. 35.

CHAPTER XL.

THE Bishops' version has co-existing in it two peculiarities directly opposed to each other. It strives often to give the translation with a quaint literality, and yet it does not scruple to interject numerous explanatory words and clauses. The following are a few specimens of the literal translations:—

"Young child," in the second chapter of Matthew; ix, 38, "that he will thrust forth labourers"; xi, 11, "he that is lesse in the kingdom"; xv, 26, 27, "little dogges"; xxi, 19, "one fygge tree"; xxv, 41, "the everlasting fire."

Mark vii, 27, "cast it vnto the little dogges"; xv, 21, "coming out of the field"; 40, "James the Little"; xvi, 2, "when the sun was risen."

Luke ii, 15, "the men, the shepherds," though it renders a similar phrase again and again, "men and brethren," without printing "and" as a supplement; xv, 12, "the portion of the substance"; 20, "and al to kissed him"—an effort to express the full meaning of the compound verb; 23, "that fatted calf"—an attempt to express the force of the repeated article; 30, "for his pleasure"—expressing the *dativus commodi*.

John xiv, 2, "In my father's house are many dwelling places."

Acts v, 41, "departed from the face of the counsel"; xiii, 34, "the holy thynges of David which are faythful."

Rom. ii, 26, "keep the ordinances of the law"; v, 4, "Patience prooffe, prooffe hope"; vi, 12, "should thereunto obey by the lustes of it"; xii, 2, "be changed in your shape"; xiv, 1, "not to doubtfulnesse of disputations"; xvi, 7, "Salute Andronicus and Junia my cousins"—a translation too definite, as in the

Authorized Version, Luke i, 36, after the Genevan, the Great Bible, and Tyndale.

1 Cor. iv, 5, "who wyl lighten the hidden thinges of darknesse"; 7, "For who separateth thee?" xiii, 3, "though I geue my body that I shoulde be burned"; xii, 7, "a pricke to the fleshe."
2 Cor.

Gal. vi, 1, "Yf a man be preuented in any fault."

Eph. iv, 9, "the lower parts"; 11, "and he gave some apostles"; 12, "into the work,—into the edifying"; 13, "measure of the age of the fulness"; 14, "to the laying waite to deceive"; 22, 24, "to lay down," "to put on holinesse of trueth."

1 Thess. iii, 10, "repayre the wantings of your faith"; iv, 15, 17, "we whiche liue, whiche remayne."

1 Tim. iii, 6, "not a young scoller."

Titus ii, 11, "healthful to al men."

Heb. i, 1, "in the prophetes . . . in the Sonne"; 3, "the brightnesse of the glory"; 14, "sent foorth into ministerie for their sakes"; ii, 4, "with signes and wonders also, and with diuers powers"; 16, "for he in no place taketh on him the angels"; iii, 14, "beginning of the substance"; v, 2, "those that erre out of the way"; 14, "have their wits exercised"; vii, 12, "if the priesthood be translated, there is made a translation of the law"; 23, "because they were forbidden by death to endure"; viii, 2, "a minister of holy things"; 11, "from the litel of them to the great of them"; ix, 1, "the fyrst (couenant) then had verily justifying ordinances"; 10, "justifyinges of the fleshe"; 28, "the seconde time shalbe seene without sinne of them whiche wayte for him"; x, 19, "libertie to enter into holy (places)"; 38, "if he withdraw himself"; xi, 8, "receive the inheritance"; 13, "and saluted."

James i, 11, "For the sunne hath rysen with heat, and the grasse hath wythered, and his floure hath fallen away," &c.; 17, "every good giving"; iii, 4, "whithersoever the lust of the governor wyl."

But they allow their scholarship to slip when they permit "Salamine" in Acts xiii, 5; "Philippos" in xvi, 8, 12; "Mile-

¹ In Ruth i, 17, "depart" is used in death depart thee and me"; so in the old active sense—"If ought but earlier editions of the Prayer Book.

tum"; in xx, 17, "Asson"; in xx, 14, "Candie," according to the margin, or "Creta, which was an high hill of Candie," in ~~xxviii~~^{xli} 7; "and Puteolus," in xxviii, 13.

But, face to face with these renderings which exhibit an aim and effort to be faithfully literal, there are other modes of bringing out the sense, by supplied terms filling out the clause, and now and then explaining it—the translator wrapping quietly into his work a hint for the interpreter. While the interpolations from the Vulgate found in the Great Bible are often abandoned, some are allowed to remain. There are also interspersed many brief exegetical clauses which are no necessary part of a genuine translation, and are out of all harmony with the earnest attempt at a closer literality. Some of them are mere supplements, which do not materially injure the rendering, as—

Genesis xiv, 15, "his seruantes were parted (in companies) agaynst them"; xxvii, 14, "and (Jacob) went."

1 Kings i, 23, "Beholde (here cometh) Nathan the Prophet"; viii, 43, (therefore) heare thou in heauen thy dwellyng place"; xviii, 19, "the prophets of the (idolles) groaues."

2 Kings iv, 3, "borowe vessels for thee (of them that are) without."

Job xxxii, 6, "and sayde (consydering that) I am yong."

Isaiah i, 5, "(for) ye are euer falling away"; 6, "there is nothing sounde in it (but) woundes"; x, 10, "(As who say) I am able to winne the kingdomes"; xxxvii, 15, "Hezekia prayed vnto the Lord (on this manner)."

Matthew, iv, 25, "and from (the regions that laye) beyond Jordane"; xiii, 48, "which when it was full (the fishers) drew to land"; xvi, 5, 7, "they had forgotten to take bread (with them)"; xxvi, 71, "another (wenche) sawe him."

Mark x, 7, "(And sayde) For this cause shall a man"; xiii, 32, "save the father (only)."

John xix, 31, "because it was the preparing (of the Sabbath)."

1 Cor. v, 10, "(I did not meane) not at all with the fornicatours of this world."

Hebrews xi, 19, "(similitude of the resurrection)"; xii, 4, "Ye have not resisted vnto (the sheddyng of) blood."

1 Peter i, 7, "might be found (to be unto you)."

But there are other supplements which are decidedly wrong, and which weaken the sense either by paraphrasing it or by adding clauses which have no authority:—

Exodus xv, 9, "I wil folow (on them), I will ouertake (them)."

Deut. i, 46, "that ye remayned (before)"; xix, 13, "put away (the crye of) innocent bloud."

Judges vii, 5, "and (so doo) them that kneele downe"; xvii, 8, "where he could finde (conuenient place)."

1 Sam. ii, 32, "thou shalt see thine enemie in the habitation (of the Lorde), and in al the wealthe whiche (God) shall give Israell."

2 Sam. ix, 11, "Mephiboseth may eate (as the king sayde) vpon my table."

Isaiah i, 7, "the destruction of enemies (in the time of warre)"; 31, "the very strong one (of your idols) shal be as towe"; ii, 21, "when he aryseth to destroy (the wicked ones of) the earth"; viii, 19, "If they say vnto you, Aske counsell at soothsayers, wytches, charmers, and conjurors (thene make them this answer)"; ix, 2, "as men that diuide the spoyel (after the victorie)"; xxviii, 6, "turne away the battayle to the gate (of the enemies)"; xl, 1, "Comfort my people (O yee prophetes)"; xlv, 7, "what shall come to passe (in tyme long to come)"; xlix, 12, "the land of Sinis (which is in the south)"; liv, 15, "loe who so gathereth together (against thee, doth it) without me"; lxv, 18, "(But the Lord sayth), Be glad."

Mark xiv, 62, "the right hand of the power (of God)."

Luke i, 56, "and (afterwarde) returned to her owne house"; xvi, 21, "to be refreshed with the crummes which fel from the rich man's borde (and no man gave vnto him)."

John xviii, 13, "(and Annas sent Christe bounde vnto Caiaphas the High Priest)."

Acts ix, 22, "by conferring (one scripture with another)."

Romans iv, 16, "by faith (in the inheritance given)"; v, 18, "(sinne came on all . . . good came)"; xi, 4, "bowed the

knee to (the image of) Baal"; xii, 17, "Providing afore hande thinges honest (not onely before God, but also) in the sight of men"; xvi, 27, "to (the same) God."

1 Cor. x, 30, "For if I by (God's) benefite may be partaker (of the gyftes of God)."

Eph. ii, 5, "by (whose) grace ye are saved."

Hebrews ii, 9, "wee see (that it was) Jesus"; v, 5, "to-day I have begotten thee (gaue it him)"; xiii, 3, "in the body (subject to adversitie)."

1 Peter ii, 2, "that ye may growe thereby (vnto salvation)."

Revelation ix, 11, "Apollyon (that is to say destroyer)."

This Bible is, however, to be commended for its occasional notice of the article, and of the conjunctions and small connecting words so often overlooked. But it often turns an adjectival epithet into the predicate of a distinct clause—as 2 Cor. v, 18, "things which are seen"; viii, 4, "things that are offered to idols"; and if it did not introduce such forms, it kept them. Nor does it mark very correctly the important distinction of tenses—rendering the aorist often as a perfect, and sometimes as a pluperfect, as in Eph. i, 4, "had chosen us." It aims at giving full force to compound terms, as Eph. vi, 12, "against worldly governors¹ of the darknesse of this world"; but it occasionally fails in its effort, as when it renders a compound verb, Rom. xv, 20, "so have I enforced myself,"²—for "I have made it a point of honour." It is, as a whole, more stately than precise; periods that might appear bald are rounded off, it loves "mouthfilling" words and sentences, and does not pare them down, if they have been employed in earlier versions—2 Cor. ix, 5, "prepare your pre-promised beneficence, that it might be ready as a beneficence and not as an extortion." 2 Pet. ii, 16, "the dumbe beast and used to the yoke."

The Episcopal revisers and their colleagues had, in general, the same Hebrew and Greek text as was possessed by the Genevan revisers. They refer to their text now and then by the phrase in the margin, "Some read," or "Beza readeth it,"

¹ κοσμοκράτορας.

² φιλοτιμούμενον.

or "The Greek readeth." But the process of revision employed in the preparation of this Elizabethan Bible led to a virtual want of uniformity in the various parts of it. There had been little consultation among the revisers, and there was not that final supervision of their work which had been suggested by Bishop Sandys. This individuality occasionally crops out—some portions being more lenient toward the old versions, and others more incisive in their changes. What would be true as a critical estimate of one book would not be true to the same extent of another book. The work was done in isolation, and, in such a case, the labour needed to bring it all into harmony would have been tantamount to another revision. It is only by earnest deliberation, the constant exchange of critical opinion, and the survey of a term or an idiom on all sides, that a good and popular version can be formed. A new rendering must be filtered through many brains before it can be finally adopted. The earliest translators were virtually individual workers, and their versions bear the stamp of personal toil. The Genevan was the first version that sprang from collegiate labour, and it had naturally on this account, no small superiority. But the Bishops, and the other scholars associated with them, seem to have wrought independently, and without any critical or literary fellowship. Archbishop Parker, who was so absorbed in civil and ecclesiastical business of all kinds, put the last hand to the work; but it could not be well done in so brief a time, and without earnest and prolonged co-operation.

The Bishops' Bible tried to classify the Books of Scripture, but upon no sound basis—"some legal, some historical, some sapiential, some prophetic"—a distinction which could not be applied without violence to the New Testament; for why should the Gospels be termed legal and not historical? According to one of the rules which Parker repeated to Cecil, an attempt was also made to point out, "with some stroke or note," such places "as may not be edifying," that they may "be excluded in public reading," as Gen. x and xi, 10-30; xxxviii, 1-11, Levit. xii-xxiv, 1st Chron. i-ix, and Neh. viii and x. Words that "sound to any offence of lightness or obscenity"

were to be changed, and more convenient terms substituted, as in 1 Samuel vi, 4, of the Great Bible, and in 1 Corinthians vi, 9, of the Genevan Bible; but other expressions that might have been removed were retained, as in 1 Samuel xxv, 22, 34, &c., and these are yet found in the Authorized Version.

In a convocation held under Grindal, in 1575, it was carried that bishops were to take care that all incumbents and curates such as are not Masters of Arts, should possess the New Testament in Latin and in English, and read a chapter every day. But such edicts do not seem to have commanded prompt or general obedience; and in 1587 Whitgift issued some new regulations, "for divers churches were not sufficiently furnished with Bibles—some having none at all, or such as be torn and defaced, and yet not of the translation authorized by the synod of bishops." To expedite obedience two editions were printed, "a bigger and less, both of which are now extant and ready." This was a deliberate attempt to sacrifice the Genevan version to the cause of uniformity, and to secure the greater circulation of the Bishops' Bible; but the stratagem did not succeed, for in the years 1587-89 we find that only two editions of the Bishops' were published, as against seven at least of the Genevan.

Cranmer's or the Great Bible was now superseded, and no edition of it was printed after 1569, but in that year there were three issues in quarto by Cawood. No edition of the Bishops' was issued after 1606, so that it survived Whitgift only two years. Whitgift often quotes the Genevan version in his Replies to his tough antagonist Cartwright, and he always mentions it in a tone of bare civility. Cartwright used it as giving edge to his arguments, and Whitgift was obliged to put it to another use. He usually calls it "the Bible printed at Geneva,"¹ or "the Geneva Bible," but he is silent as to its merits, and as to the character of its translators; whereas Cartwright styles them "those learned and godly men." Whitgift could not vilify the renderings—he was too scholarly a man to indulge in such hostile criticism; but he longed and laboured that the Bishops' Bible should be universally used, and, indeed, if

¹ Works, vol. I, pp. 203, 294, &c.

his "Injunctions" had been obeyed, there would soon have been no copies left in the printer's hands. The Genevan was not, however, so easily thrust aside. From 1560, the year of its first publication, to the end of Elizabeth's reign there were published about ninety editions of it, but under thirty of the Bishops'. The Genevan had thus three times the circulation of the Bishops'; nay, in the year 1599, there appear to have been seven editions of it, some of them, however, printed abroad. The Bishops' Bible, which never had any great popularity, was not printed after 1606, as we have said, though its New Testament was published several times;¹ but the Genevan kept its ground till about the year 1644. After 1590 the demand for the Bishops' seems to have greatly slackened, for from that year to the end of the century only three editions were published; but about thirty of the Genevan, a third of them being only New Testaments. From the accession of James to 1611 there was apparently published only one edition of the Bishops', but thirty of the Genevan.²

Thus, for a time, three different versions were in circulation—a fact that would have delighted Coverdale, but it must have been somewhat embarrassing to plain people of ordinary education and intellect. If any one appealed to Scripture, it might be asked whether the appeal was to the Great Bible, the Genevan, or the Bishops'. It appears, however, that this embarrassment created a desire for unity. In the library of the House of Lords there is the sketch of "an Act for reducing diversities of Bibles now extant in the English tongue to one settled Vulgar translated from the original." The preamble declares "that great errors arise, and papistry and atheism increase, from the variety of translations of the Bible, while many desire an authorized translation." The proposal was that the Lords Spiritual, or any six of them, may assemble, treat, and deal touching the accomplishment of the work, and call for the assistance of students of either university, &c. The undated paper is believed to refer to a period after 1568.³ Gregory Martin did not overlook this

¹ See page 36.

Testament between 1560 and 1570.

² There had also been published four editions of Tyndale's New Bible, p. x, 2nd edition.

³ Westcott's History of the English

plurality of versions: "We must learn," he says, in his own style and spirit, "what English translation is read in their church (which were hard to know, it changeth so oft) before we may be held to accuse them of false translation, how shall we be sure that they will stand to any of their translations?"¹ From the first read in their church they flee to that which is now read, and from that again to the later Genevan Bibles, neither read in their churches nor of greater authority among them, and we doubt not but that they will as fast flee from this to the former again." But Fulke defends with ability and learning the three versions in use—the Great Bible, the Genevan, and the Bishops'. His words are a noble vindication of the fidelity of all the translators: "We never go from that text and ancient reading which all the fathers used and expounded; but we translate that most usual text which was first printed out of the most ancient copies that could be found; or if any be since found, or if the ancient fathers did read otherwise than the usual copies, or any word that is in any way material in annotation, commentaries, readings, and sermons, we spare not, and declare it as occasion serveth. We never flee from the Hebrew and Greeke in anie place, much less in places of controversie; but we alwaies hold, as near as we can, that which the Greeke and Hebrew signifieth. But if, in places of controversie, we take witnesse of the Greeke, or Vulgar Latine, where the Hebrew or the Greeke may be thought ambiguous, I trust no wise man will count this a flight from the Hebrew and Greeke, which we alwaies translate aright, whether it agree with the 70, or Vulgar Latin, or no."² "Happy, and thrice happy, hath our English nation bene, since God hath given learned translators to expresse in our mother tongue the heavenly mysteries of his Holy Word, delivered to his Church in the Hebrew and Greeke languages; who although they have, in some matters of no importance unto salvation, as men bene deceived; yet have they faithfully delivered the whole substance of the heavenly doctrine conteyned in the

¹ Discoverie of the Manifold Corruptions, p. 9-11, Rhemes, 1582. ² Defence of Sincere and True Translations, &c., pp. 99, 100, Parker Society Edition.

Holy Scriptures, without any hereticale translations or wilfull corruptions."¹ When in 1570, twelve years before Gregory Martin wrote, the Queen had been formally excommunicated, the result was that the nation, enlightened and braced by the free circulation of the English Scriptures, began to realize more fully its final severance from popish thraldom, and to cling to Elizabeth more closely as the guardian of its liberties, so that the day of her accession was from that period observed as a popular festival, and joyously hailed as "the birth-day of the Gospel."

¹ Defence of Sincere and True Translations, &c., p. 591, Parker Society Edition.

THE RHEIMS AND DOUAI VERSION.

"THAT the Scriptures be not to be set forth in the vulgar tongue to be read of all sorts of people, every part of them, without any limitation of time, place, and persons, they seem to be moved with these considerations: first, that it is not necessary; next, that it is not convenient; thirdly, that it is not profitable; fourthly, that it is dangerous and hurtful; and lastly, although it were accorded the common people to have liberty to read the Bible in their own tongue, yet that the translations of late years made by those that have divided themselves from the Catholic Church be not to be allowed, as worthily suspected not to be sound and assured."

HARDING, 1563.

CHAPTER XLI.

THE version which is now to be considered was immediately and professedly taken from the Vulgate—that is, the revision and translation of Jerome. We do not, however, like the Rhemists, hold the Vulgate in so high esteem as to put it in the place of the Greek original. Its fidelity and literary merits are not beyond impeachment, though occasionally its readings in the New Testament are confirmed by Greek MSS. of high authority: like the expressions, "Spirit of Jesus," Acts xvi, 7; "the Lord Christ," 1 Pet. iii, 15. Wycliffe's old and literal translation of it was rough, for the Latin of the Vulgate is rough also—in its archaic forms, and its numerous and unusual compounds; in its peculiar words and constructions; its large class of verbs, verbal forms, and nouns made out of adjectives in its frequent employment of the genitive of abstract nouns in room of a qualificative epithet, and of prepositions to mark a relation that might have been expressed by a case; in its use both of a gerund¹ and of *quod* with the indicative or subjunctive for an infinitive; and in the approximation of its pronouns to the Greek article. Its style was mixed through its circulation in North Africa. The classic order and position of the words are often violated, so that possessive pronouns became of necessary frequency; the distinction between the perfect and imperfect, especially of the substantive verb, is lost sight of; *quia*² ap-

¹ Matt. xx, 19, "ad illudendum, et flagellandum et crucifigendum"; "that it was said"—again and again though John xix, 16, reads "tradidit eis illum ut crucifigeretur."
² As "audistis quia dictum est"—in Matt. v, and in vii, 23, xxii, 16, and Luke i, 58.

pears, not in the sense of "because," but of "that"; and *ac*, *atque*, *et* are used without discrimination.¹ Older forms which

¹ There are also such paronomasia as "Neque nubent neque nubentur" (Cod. Pal., "nubunt") Matt. xxii, 30; "Non venit ministrari, sed ministrare," compared with Mark x, 45; Gen. ii, 23, "Hæc vocabitur Virago, quoniam de viro sumpta est." There are such imitations of the Greek as Luke xiii, 33, "Non capit prophetam perire extra Jerusalem" (Codex Palatinus, "non est possibile"); Matt. vi, 26, "Nonne vos magis pluris estis illis?" xxiv, 22, "Non fieret salva omnis caro"—Campbell tartly remarking on this last rendering "that Arias found nothing to alter in it, in order to bring it down to his own level." Other solecisms may be adduced: Gen. xxi, 26, "Non audiivi præter hodie"; Gen. xlii, 13, "Alius non est super,"—for "superest"; Ps. lxvii, 20, "Benedictus Dominus die quotidie"; Ps. cxv, 1, "In convertendo Dominus captivitatem Sion facti sumus sicut consolati"; Luke vii, 37,² "Lamentavimus vobis"; xxi, 38, "Omnis populus manicabat ad eum"; John xv, 2, "Ut fructum plus afferat." Besides, there are peculiar forms of spelling, and of case, number, conjugation, and syntax. There are many nouns ending in -mentum, like inquinamentum, operimentum; in -amen, like cogitamen, spiramen; in -arium, like atramentarium; in -ulum, like habitaculum, pinnaculum; in -entia, like concupiscentia, sufferentia; in -itas, like religiositas, supervacuitas; in -or, like dulcor, placor; in -udo, like grossitudo, pœnitudo; in -ula, like auricula, casula;—adjectives in -ibilis, like

concupiscibilis, inextinguibilis; in -bundus, as fumigabundus, formula-bundus; in -atus, like linguatus, pudoratus. There are also verbs like plagiare, tribulare; compounds like animaequus, captivus; phrases like "a longe," "de semel"; nouns which are Greek terms expressed in Roman letters, as brabium, grabatus. Terms occur also with an unusual signification: argumentum, a mark or sketch; cœnapura, the preparation (for a series of conjectures as to the origin and incoming of this phrase, see Rönisch, p. 367); conditio, creation; conversatio, manner of life; diffidentia, unbelief; honestas, riches; opinio, rumour; prævaricatio, transgression; resolutio, death; sacramentum, mystery; substantia, goods; fidelis, believing; impossibilis, impotent; incredibilis, unbelieving; advocare, to console; deprecari, to ask earnestly; honestare, to make rich (honorarium); Archbishop Parker speaks of "honesting a Mr. Dr. Clark with a room in the Arches" (Correspondence, p. 411, Parker Soc. ed.) These terms are but a brief specimen, but may serve to show the peculiar Latin of the Vulgate; and, living in the language of the people, such peculiarities abound also in the old Latin version, the Itala. The critical remarks of Lord Macaulay on the kind of Latin used in the Church service in contrast with the English of the Liturgy, bear on the point before us, and are worth quotation. "The English Liturgy indeed gains by being compared even with those fine ancient liturgies from which it

had passed out of classical use reappear in the Vulgate through the tenacity of the popular speech.¹

But though we cannot hold such exaggerated views of the merits of the Vulgate as did the Rhemists, to whom it was "true and authentical scripture," nor accept the Tridentine edict which so unduly exalted it, yet we cannot but regard it as of great value, even with the conflicting variations between the Sixtine and Clementine editions. The text of the Vulgate was discussed at the Council of Trent in 1546, but it was at length declared to be "authentic."² A revision of it was carried out by a board, of which Cardinal Caraffa was president, but Pope Sixtus arbitrarily altered the text, and then "in the plenitude of apostolic power" authorized it for the churches. On its publication in 1590, it was found to be very imperfect, and a second company, under the presidency of Cardinal Colonna, undertook another revision, which was published in 1592, in the reign of Pope Clement VIII, and it too has many blunders. The discrepancies between those editions, both formally sanctioned by papal

is to a great extent taken. The essential qualities of devotional eloquence, conciseness, majestic simplicity, pathetic earnestness of supplication, sobered by a profound reverence, are common between the translations and the originals. But in the subordinate graces of diction the originals must be allowed to be far inferior to the translations. And the reason is obvious. The technical phraseology of Christianity did not become a part of the Latin language till that language had passed the age of maturity and was sinking into barbarism. But the technical phraseology of Christianity was found in the Anglosaxon and in the Norman French, long before the union of those two dialects had produced a third dialect superior to either. The Latin of the Roman Catholic services,

therefore, is Latin in the last stage of decay. The English of our services is English in all the vigour and suppleness of early youth. To the great Latin writers, to Terence and Lucretius, to Cicero and Cæsar, to Tacitus and Quintilian, the noblest compositions of Ambrose and Gregory would have seemed to be, not merely bad writing, but senseless gibberish." History of England, vol. III, p. 475.

¹ Itala und Vulgata, das Sprachidiom der Urchristlichen Itala und der Katholischen Vulgata, unter Berücksichtigung der Römischen Volkssprache. Von Hermann Rönisch, 2nd ed., Marburg, 1875. Kaulen, Geschichte der Vulgata, p. 131.

² See Geschichte der Vulgata, von Leander van Ess, Tübingen 1824.

authority, are very numerous, as may be seen in James's *Bellum Papale*, 1600.¹

Yet, in spite of such points in its history, the Vulgate has many claims for the place which it so long held, and for the good which it so often effected. It was, in the absence of the original, the only accessible Bible in mediæval Western Europe — "a light shining," though with veiled lustre, "in a dark place." It did its appointed work, and brought peace and strength to many hearts, opening up to them a glimpse of the glorified One above and beyond the crucifix, creating a fulness of trust that felt no need of saintly mediation, nursing a loyalty to Him so intense and absorbing that it looked down upon the keys of St. Peter as a paltry symbol, while it sustained a confidence in Him that hard dogma could not deaden, and an adoration of Him which a complicated and inflexible ritual could not petrify. The religious community, whose book it was, kept the Roman empire from falling into barbarism at its dissolution. In spite of its growing superstition and tyranny, the Western Church scattered round it many blessings. Music, painting, and architecture were fostered by it; the figured windows in the churches were the poor man's Bible, where he saw in vivid group and colouring the power and pity of the Son of Mary.² Its compact organization gave it a great power, which it often wielded for the good of society in days of ignorance and war. It broke the bonds of the serf, opened an asylum for the exile and outcast, restrained the fury of the oppressor, and softened the haughty rigour of the nobility. Grandees quailed before its ministers invested with a superhuman authority which they were afraid to resist, and were unable to define, for its mastery stretched into the invisible world. The abbey was often a rebuke to the castle, and was an almshouse for the poor, an hospital for the sick, an inn for the traveller, and a retreat for the weary and forlorn in heart. Its farms presented the best

¹ Reprinted under the editorial care of J. E. Cox, M.A., London, 1840.

² The "*Biblia pauperum*," con-

sisting of forty plates, printed from wooden blocks, and depicting scenes and persons from Scripture, served a similar purpose.

specimens of tillage, and its blooming orchards were a reproof to all who loitered in the "vineyard of the sluggard." In the midst of many drawbacks, inconsistencies, and errors, the Latin Church may glory in pointing to the heroic and self-denying toils and sufferings of its missionaries and martyrs, whose romantic lives are grander than fiction, and who met their death, not merely with saintly calmness, but prophetic exultation. Those noble souls were baptized with the Holy Spirit; the true unction filled them with a seraphic devoutness, which did not depend on a gorgeous service with its music, incense, and images. The mystics who had felt the power of the unseen, and were rapt into hidden communing with God, did not rest on a sacerdotal ministry. The Houses, especially of the Benedictine class, so magnificent in architecture, often and honestly strove in earlier times to realize the ideal of their founder. In them was conserved whatever of science or art was known; and in them was copied, for circulation, the Latin Bible which preserved for centuries the knowledge of the Gospel, and gave their first inspiration to the Reformers. The old saying was "*claustrum sine armario, castrum sine armentario*." The Scriptorium was often filled with busy and tasteful copyists. Ordericus Vitalis tells of a monk who, though he had been a habitual transgressor of monastic rules, yet had copied a handsome volume of Scripture, and that, when after death he stood before the divine tribunal in the crisis of his destiny, the accusing spirits and the good angels made a bargain that every letter in the transcribed Bible should stand in merit against every sin adduced, the result being that by the credit of a single letter the trembling culprit escaped — "the mercy of the Judge being extended toward him."

On the other hand the popish system became at length exclusive, claimed of divine right a paramount jurisdiction over all kingdoms, interfered with their policy by diplomacy, menace, and anathema, in order to bind them as vassals to the Papal chair. The primates in England and in other countries became statesmen and were rewarded by preferments for their work as politicians; the mitre proudly reared itself above coronets, and the dispensation of human

law left little room for the ministry of the Gospel. Wherever the Papacy had the power, it punished as heresy all variation of opinion, and repressed free thought, honest inquiry, and mental development. In short, it obscured the way of salvation by its ecclesiastical apparatus, the priest standing before Christ received confession, granted absolution, or carried on a scandalous traffic in indulgences; penance took the visible place of "godly sorrow," and the mass with its pretentious miracle of transubstantiation superseded an ordinance sublime in its simplicity, for its grand purpose is told in nine English monosyllables—"Ye do show the Lord's death till He come." The word of God was virtually proscribed, and the reading of it put under a ban, in order to keep the people passive under the tutelage of the priesthood. Cardinal Ximenes, who had spent at least £25,000 and many years of anxiety on the production of the Complutensian Polyglott and its various texts, shuddered at the desecration involved in giving the conquered and proselytized Moors the Bible in their own language, as Archbishop Talavera had suggested—"for it would be casting pearls before swine."¹

The Romish Church has ever been reluctant to give vernacular Scriptures to the people. The Council of Toulouse in 1229 made a stern prohibition, and the Council of Trent followed the same course in 1564. This act was confirmed by Pope Clement VIII in 1596, by Benedict XIV in 1757, by Pius VII in 1816, by Leo XII in 1824, and by Gregory XVI in 1844, whose encyclical brief told his "venerable brethren" to seize out of the hands of the faithful "Bibles translated into the vulgar tongue." Nor has Pius IX been behind his predecessors in this antibiblical crusade. But Pius VI wrote in 1778 to Martini a commendation of his Italian version, and the letter, translated into English, is found in many modern editions. Copies of the Scriptures are now common among Catholics.

Some of the reasons for refusing the Bible to the laity are amusing, and others are advanced with perverse ingenuity.

¹ Life of Ximenes, English Translation, p. 72.

One of the divines of Douai, Dr. Kellison, in his answer to Sutcliffe, argues that as the inscription on the cross was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, "therefore the church would have God's word not to be written commonly in any other tongue than in one of those three sanctified tongues."¹ After saying that, on the question of the circulation of the Bible, Popery and Protestantism are antagonistic, "and we glory in avowing it," Cardinal Wiseman² asserts that the Catholics "do not give the Bible indiscriminately to all, because God himself has not so given it"; that the "reading" of it is not a term of salvation, while "hearing is"; that "paper and ink are not the badges of His apostles' calling, but the keys of the kingdom"; that the church has no instinct toward Bible reading; and that where "universal license to read the Scriptures prevails, church government declines"—"We do not encourage the people to read them, we do not spread them to the utmost among them. Certainly not." There was an especial and instinctive horror of an open English Bible both in the days of Wycliffe and Tyndale, as if the hierarchy had forecast what the result might come to be.

For a time at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth, Catholics attended the English service; but the Inquisition and the Pope on being consulted strongly denounced all such compromise. Several Catholics had left England on the accession of Elizabeth, and had naturally found a refuge in the Popish countries of the Continent. The English Bible in use could not be appreciated or used by them, for it was tainted in its very origin. But as it was in extensive circulation, they were afraid of it, and thought to check its influence by a rival version—guarded by stringent dogmatic notes. The English refugees at Geneva had made a popular translation, why might not Popish exiles do a similar work for their own party still residing in the land from which they had fled? It was not indeed deemed necessary that Catholics should have or read a Bible in their mother tongue; and the history of the English Bible showed that the Romish powers

¹ Rhemes, 1608. Cotton's Rhemes and Doway, p. 5.

² Catholic Doctrine, pp. 20, 21.

steadily discountenanced all such versions, and sometimes put to death both translators and possessors as guilty of treason against the Pope and the authority of the church. But it was somehow felt that Popish religionists should be put upon a level with their Protestant countrymen, and that they should have prepared for them a Bible in English—or at least in such English as would show that it belonged to a Latin community.

In referring to the publication of this New Testament King James' translators were tempted to say in their preface: "Now the Church of Rome would seeme at the length to bear a motherly affection towards her children, and to allow them the Scriptures in their mother tongue: but indeed it is a gift, not deseruing to be called a gift, an vnprofitable gift: they must first get a Licence in writing before they may vse them, and to get that, they must approue themselues to their Confessor. . . . Yea, so vnwilling they are to communicate the Scriptures to the peoples vnderstanding in any sort, that they are not ashamed to confesse, that wee forced them to translate it into English against their wills. This seemeth to argue a bad cause, or a bad conscience, or both. Sure we are, that it is not he that hath good gold, that is afraid to bring it to the touchstone, but he that hath the counterfeit; neither is it the true man that shunneth the light, but the malefactor, least his deedes should be reproofed: neither is it the plaine dealing merchant that is vnwilling to haue the waights, or the meteyard brought in place, but he that vseth deceit. But we will let them alone for this fault, and returne to translation."

A number of English Catholics had settled at Douai in Flanders in 1568, and established a "Seminarie" for the training of priests who were to win England back to the Catholic faith. Many agents trained in the seminary did visit England at various times, some with the resolution of assassinating the queen; and several of these enthusiasts, nurtured by the Pope and Philip II of Spain, were discovered, as were Campian and his colleagues, Sherwin and Briant, who, on the 1st December, 1581, paid the penalty of their life not as Papists but as traitors. The queen,

quite aware of these plots to murder her, said once, in addressing her Parliament, "I know no creature that breathes whose life standeth hourly in more peril than mine own." After a Huguenot riot the magistrates ordered the departure of the Catholic refugees, and the college was broken up by De Requescens, the representative of Spain, but the Duke of Guise gave it a residence at Rheims in France. The Seminary returned to Douai in 1593, and it found a final resting place in England at Old Hall Green, in the parish of Standon, and county of Hertford. At Rheims the work of translating was carried on, and accordingly the New Testament was published at that place in 1582. One of the translators, Gregory Martin, had been one of the original scholars of St. John's College, Oxford, and M.A. in 1564. After concealing his change of opinion for some time he passed over to Douai in 1570, and after a short sojourn at Rome he became a divinity reader in the English seminary of Rheims. He died 1584. He is declared by Wood to have been "an excellent linguist," exactly read and versed in the Holy Scriptures, and went beyond others of his time in humane literature." He was the principal translator of the entire Bible; and his death is said to have been hastened by his incessant toil. William Allen, another of the company, had been a canon of York and principal of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, in the reign of Queen Mary; but going at her death to Louvain, he was made a doctor of divinity, a canon of Cambray, and afterwards of Rheims, where, by his energy and enthusiasm, he was the chief means of establishing the Popish seminary for English students. Under Pope Sixtus V he was consecrated Archbishop of Mechlin and raised to the rank of cardinal. Had the Spanish Armada conquered, he, as "Cardinal of England," was to have been Archbishop of Canterbury and Legate; and he had composed and printed in Flanders a pastoral address to be carried over by the Duke of Parma and circulated as soon as he effected a landing.¹ His extreme outbursts of prejudice went far beyond truth, as when he says of the

¹ Dewes, *Parliaments of Queen Elizabeth*, p. 328.

queen, "She is a caitiff under God's and Holy Church's curse, given up to a reprobate mind, therefore her open enormities and her secret sins must be great and not numerable." Nicholas Sanders, another notorious Catholic of that period, was so unvarnished as to assert that the prayers offered to the Virgin in the Catholic Church are in the English Prayer Book presented to Queen Elizabeth. Bishop Andrewes says of him, "His forehead was surely flint and his tongue a razor."¹ Another of the band was Richard Bristow, M.A., Christ's Church, Oxford, afterwards Fellow of Exeter College, who, going in 1569 to Louvain, abjured Protestantism. He became reader of divinity at Douai, and afterwards at Rheims, where he prepared the notes of the New Testament. Thomas Worthington studied at Oxford, but joined his party at Douai, and then was sent to Rheims, where he became president of the college. He is said to have prepared the annotations and tables for the Old Testament.

The New Testament was published at Rheims in 1582, with the following long title:

"The New Testament of Jesus Christ, translated faithfully into English, out of the authentical Latin, according to the best corrected copies of the same, diligently conferred with the Greeke and other editions in diuers languages: With argvments of bookes and chapters, annotations, and other necessarie helpes, for the better vnderstanding of the text, and specially for the discouerie of the corruptions of diuers late translations, and for cleering the controuersies in religion, of these daies: IN THE ENGLISH COLLEGE OF RHEMES.

"Psal. 118. Da mihi intellectum, et scrutabor legem tuam, et custodiam illam in toto corde meo. That is, Giue me vnderstanding, and I wil searche thy law and wil keepe it with my whole hart.

"S. Aug., tract. 2 in Epist. Joan. Omnia quae in Scripturis sanctis, ad instructionem et salutem nostram, intente oportet audire; maxime memoriae commendanda sunt, quae aduersus hereticos valent plurimum: quorum insidiae, infirmiores quosque et negligentiores circumuenire non cessant.

¹ Tortura Torti, p. 143.

"That is,

"All things that are readde in holy Scriptures we must heare with great attention, to our instruction and saluation, but those things specially must be commended to memorie, which make most against Heretikes: whose deceites cease not to circument and beguile al the weaker sort and the more negligent persons.

"Printed at Rhemes, by John Fogny. 1582. Cvm privilegio."

The Preface is long and elaborate, its general spirit being that of defence and explanation; admitting that what they have done is after all a superfluous labour, there being no real necessity for it, and its only occasion being "the present time, state, and condition of our country." They are at a loss to assign a specific reason for a work which Scripture forbids, and yet does not forbid; allows, and still disallows; and their statements are given with such a nicety of distinctions and such balancings, that only subtile minds can apprehend them; for their church neither prohibits, nor commands, nor yet treats the matter as one of forbearance. As they acted on such ambiguous views, their English Bible is scarcely intelligible to common people, so many ecclesiastical terms are preserved unchanged or are slightly altered. The version is completely papalized, for they purposed to add a new bulwark to their Zion, and make the interposition of the priesthood still necessary to the full understanding of the Word of God. The Latinized English of the version would have delighted the heart of Bishop Gardiner. Appeals are made to the fathers on these points, and there are eloquent descriptions of the abuses of profane and promiscuous Scripture reading. Other translations are also tersely censured.

As none of the more recent editions of the Rheims New Testament contain the preface, a few paragraphs from it may be given:—

"Which translation we doe not for al that publish, vpon erroneous opinion 1 of necessitie, that the holy Scriptures should alwaies be in our mother tongue, or 2 that they ought, or were ordained by God, to be read indifferently of

al, or 3 could be easily vnderstood of euery one that readeth or heareth them in a knowen language: or 4 that they were not often, through mans malice or infirmitie, pernicious and much hurtful to many: 5 or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more conuenient in it self, and more agreeable to Gods word and honour, or edification of the faithful, to haue them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in the Ecclesiastical learned languages: Not for these nor any such like causes do we translate this sacred booke, but vpon special consideration of the present time, state, and condition of our countrie, vnto which, diuers things are either necessarie, or profitable and medicinable now, that otherwise in the peace of the Church were neither much requisite, nor perchance wholly tolerable."

"1. In this matter, to marke only the wisdom and moderation of holy Church and the gouernours thereof on the one side, and the indiscrete zeale of the popular, and their factious leaders, on the other, is a high point of prudence. These later, partly of simplicitie, partly of curiositie, and specially of pride and disobedience, haue made claime in this case for the common people, with plausible pretences many, but good reasons none at al. The other, to whom Christ hath giuen charge of our soules, the dispensing of Gods mysteries and treasures (among which holy Scripture is no small store) and the feeding his familie in season with foode fit for euery sort, haue neither of old nor of late, euer wholly condemned al vulgar versions of Scripture, nor haue at any time generally forbidden the faithful to reade the same: yet they haue not by publike authoritie prescribed, commaunded, or authentically euer recommended any such interpretation to be indifferently vsed of al men. . . .

"Now since Luthers reuolt also, diuers learned Catholikes for the more speedy abolishing of a number of false and impious translations put forth by sundry sectes, and for the better preservation or reclaime of many good soules endangered thereby, haue published the Bible in the several languages of almost al the principal prouinces of the Latin Church: no other bookes in the world being so pernicious as heretical

translations of the Scriptures, poisoning the people vnder colour of diuine authoritie, and not many other remedies being more soueraigne against the same (if it be vsed in order, discretion, and humilitie) then the true, faithful, and sincere interpretation opposed therevnto.

"2. Which causeth the holy Church not to forbid vtterly any Catholic translation, though she allow not the publishing or reading of any absolutely and without exception, or limitation: knowing by her diuine and most sincere wisdom, how, where, when, and to whome these her Maisters and Spouses giftes are to be bestowed to the most good of the faithful: and therefore neither generally permitteth that which muste needes doe hurt to the vnworthy, nor absolutely condemneth that which may doe much good to the worthy. Where upon, the order which many a wise man wished for before, was taken by the Deputies of the late famous Council of Trent in this behalfe, and confirmed by supreme authoritie, that the holy Scriptures, though truly and Catholically translated into vulgar tonges, yet may not be indifferently readde of al men, nor of any other then such as haue expresse licence therevnto of their lawful Ordinaries, with good testimonie from their Curates or Confessors, that they be humble, discrete and deuout persons, and like to take much good, and no harme thereby. Which prescript, though in these daies of ours it can not be so precisely obserued, as in other times and places, where there is more due respecte of the Churches authoritie, rule, and discipline: yet we trust al wise and godly persons wil vse the matter in the meanwhile, with such moderation, meekeness, and subiection of hart, as the handling of so sacred a booke, and sincere senses of Gods truth therein, and the holy Canons, Councils, reason, and religion do require.

"Wherein, though for due preservation of this diuine worke from abuse and prophanation, and for the better bridling of the intolerable insolencie of proud, curious, and contentious wittes, the gouernours of the Church guided by Gods Spirit, as euer before, so also vpon more experience of the maladie of this time then before, haue taken more exacte order both for the readers and translatours in these later ages, then of old,

yet we must not imagin that in the primitiue Church, either euery one that vnderstoode the learned tonges wherein the Scriptures were written, or other languages into which they were translated, might without reprehension, read, reason, dispute, turne and tosse the Scriptures: or that our forefathers suffered euery schole-maister, scholer, or Grammarian that had a little Greeke or Latin, straight to take in hand the holy Testament: or that the translated Bibles into the vulgar tonges, were in the hands of euery husband man, artificer, prentice, boies, girles, mistresse, maide, man: that they were sung, plaied, alleaged, of euery tinker, tauerner, rimer, minstrel: that they were for table talke, for alebenches, for boates and barges, and for euery prophane person and companie. No, in those better times men were neither so il, nor so curious of them selues, so to abuse the blessed booke of Christ: neither was there any such easy meanes before printing was inuented, to disperse the copies into the handes of euery man, as now there is.

"They were then in Libraries, Monasteries, Colleges, Churches, in Bishops, Priests, and some deuout principal Lay mens houses and handes: who vsed them with feare and reuerence, and specially such partes as pertained to good life and maners, not medling, but in pulpit and schooles (and that moderately to) with the hard and high mysteries and places of greater difficultie. The poore ploughman could then, in labouring the ground, sing the hymnes and psalmes either in knowen or vnknown languages, as they heard them in the holy Church, though they could neither reade nor knowe the sense, meaning, and mysteries of the same. Such holy persons of both sexes, to whom St. Hierom in diuers Epistles to them, commendeth the reading and meditation of holy Scriptures, were diligent to search al the godly histories and imitable examples of chastitie, humilitie, obedience, clemencie, pouertie, penance, renouncing the world: they noted specially the places that did breede the hatred of sinne, feare of Gods iudgement, delight in spiritual cogitations: they referred them selues in al hard places, to the iudgement of the auncient fathers and their maisters in religion, neuer presuming to contend, controule,

teach or talke of their owne sense and phantasie, in deepe questions of diuinitie. Then the Virgins did meditate vpon the places and examples of chastitie, modestie and demurenesse: the married, on coniugal faith and continencie: the parents, how to bring vp their children in faith and feare of God: the Prince, how to rule: the subiect, how to obey: the Priest, how to teach: the people, how to learne.

"3. Then the scholer taught not his maister, the sheepe controuled not the Pastor, the young student set not the Doctor to schoole, nor reprobued their fathers of error and ignorance. Or if any were in those better daies (as in al times of heresie such must needes be) that had itching eares, tikling tongues and wittes, curious and contentious disputers, hearers, and talkers rather than doers of Gods word: such the Fathers did euer sharply reprehend, counting them vnworthy and vnprofitable readers of the holy Scripture. . . .

"We therefore hauing compassion to see our beloued countriemen, with extreme danger of their soules, vse only such profane translations, and erroneous mens mere phantasies, for the pure and blessed word of truth, much also moued thereunto by the desires of many deuout persons: haue set forth, for you (benigne readers) the new Testament to begin withal, trusting that it may giue occasion to you, after diligent perusing thereof, to lay away at lest such their impure versions as hitherto you haue ben forced to occupie. How wel we haue done it, we must not be iudges, but referre al to Gods Church and our superiors in the same, to them we submit our selues, and this, and al other our labours, to be in part or in the whole, reformed, corrected, altered, or quite abolished: most humbly desiring pardon if through our ignorance, temeritie, or other humane infirmitie, we haue any where mistaken the sense of the holy Ghost, further promising, that if hereafter we espie any of our owne errors, or if any other, either frende of good wil, or aduersarie for desire of reprehension, shall open vnto vs the same: we wil not (as Protestants doe) for defense of our estimation, or of pride and contention, by wrangling wordes wilfully persist in them, but be most glad to heare of them, and in the next edition or otherwise to correct them:

for it is truth that we seeke for, and Gods honour: which being had either by good intention, or by occasion, al is wel. This we professe only, that we haue done our endeouour with praier, much feare and trembling, lest we should dangerously erre in so sacred, high, and diuine a work: that we haue done it with al faith, diligence, and sinceritie: that we haue vsed no partialitie for the disadvantage of our aduersaries, nor no more licence then is sufferable in translating of holy Scriptures: continually keeping our selues as neere as is possible, to our text and to the very words and phrases which by long vse are made venerable, though to some prophane or delicate eares they may seeme more hard or barbarous, as the whole style of Scripture doth lightly to such at the beginning: acknowledging with St. Hierom, that in other writings it is ynough to giue in translation, sense for sense, but that in Scriptures, lest we misse the sense, we must keepe the very wordes. . . .

"Now, though the text thus truly translated, might sufficiently, in the sight of the learned and al indifferent men, both controule the aduersaries corruptions, and proue that the holy Scripture whereof they haue made so great vauntes, maketh nothing for their new opinions, but wholly for the Catholike Churches beleefe and doctrine, in al the pointes of difference betwixt vs: yet knowing that the good and simple may easily be seduced by some few obstinate persons of perdition (whom we see giuen ouer into a reprobate sense, to whom the Gospel, which in it self is the odour of life to saluation, is made the odour of death to damnation, ouer whose eyes for sinne and disobedience God suffereth a veile or couer to lie, whiles they read the New Testament, euen as the Apostle saith the Iewes haue til this day, in reading of the old, that as the one sort can not finde Christ in the Scriptures, reade they neuer so much, so the other can not finde the Catholike Church nor her doctrine there neither), and finding by experience this saying of St. Augustin to be most true, 'If the preiudice of any erroneous persuasion preoccupate the mind, whatsoever the Scripture hath to the contrarie, men take it for a figuratiue speach': for these causes, and somewhat to help the faithful reader in the difficulties of diuers places, we haue also set forth

reasonable large Annotations, thereby to shew the studious reader in most places pertaining to the controuersies of this time, both the heretical corruptions and false deductions, and also the Apostolike tradition, the expositions of the holy fathers, the decrees of the Catholike Church and most ancient Councils: which means whosoever trusteth not, for the sense of the holy Scriptures, but had rather folow his priuate iudgement or the arrogant spirit of these Sectaries, he shal worthily through his owne wilfulnes be deceiued: beseeching al men to looke with diligence, sinceritie, and indifference, into the case that concerneth no lesse then euery ones eternal salvation or damnation. . . .

"In this ovr translation, because we wish it to be most sincere, as becommeth a Catholike translation, and haue endeououred so to make it: we are very precise and religious in folowing our copie, the old vulgar approued Latin: not only in sense, which we hope we alwaies doe, but sometimes in the very words also and phrases, which may seeme to the vulgar reader and to common English eares not yet acquainted therewith, rudenesse or ignorance: but to the discrete Reader that deeply weigheth and considereth the importance of sacred words and speeches, and how easily the voluntarie Translatour may misse the true sense of the Holy Ghost, we doubt not but our consideration and doing therein, shal seeme reasonable and necessarie: yea and that al sortes of Catholike Readers wil in short time thinke that familiar, which at the first may seeme strange, and wil esteeme it more, when they shal otherwise be taught to vnderstand it, then if it were the common known English.

"For example, we translate often thus, 'Amen, amen, I say unto you.' Which as yet seemeth strange, but after a while it wil be as familiar, as 'Amen,' in the end of al praieres and Psalmes, and even as when we end with 'Amen,' it soundeth far better then, 'So beit': so in the beginning, 'Amen, Amen,' must needes by vse and custom sound far better, then, 'Verily verily.' Which in deede doth not expresse the asseueration and assurance signified in this Hebrue word, besides that it is the solemne and usual word of our Sauour to expresse a vehement

asseueration, and therefore is not changed, neither in the Syriake nor Greeke, nor vulgar Latin Testament, but is preserved and vsed of the Euangelistes and Apostles, them selues, euen as Christ spake it 'propter sanctiorem auctoritatem' as St. Augustin saith of this and of 'Allelu-ia, for the more holy and sacred authoritie thereof.' li. 2 Doct. Christ, c. 11. And therefore do we keepe the word 'Allelu-ia,' Apoc. 19, as it is both in Greeke and Latin yea and in al the English translations, though in their bookes of common praier they translate it, 'Praise ye the Lord.' Againe if 'Hosanna, Raca, Belial,' and such like be yet vntranslated in the English Bibles, why may not we say, 'Corbana,' and 'Parasceue': specially when they Englishing this later thus, 'the preparation of the Sabbath,' put three words more into the text then the Greeke word doth signifie. Mat. 27, 62. And others saying thus, 'After the day of preparing,' make a cold translation and short of the sense: as if they should translate Sabbath, 'the resting,' for 'Parasceue' is as solemne a word for the Sabbath eue, as 'Sabbath' is for the Iewes seventh day, and now among Christians much more solemner, taken for Good-friday only. These words then we thought it far better to keepe in the text, and to tel their signification in the margent or in a table for that purpose, then to disgrace both the text and them with translating them.

"Moreouer, we presume not in hard places to mollifie the speeches or phrases, but religiously keepe them word for word, and point for point, for fear of missing, or restraining the sense of the holy Ghost to our phantasie, as Eph. 6, 'Against the spirituals of wickedness in the celestials,' and, 'What to me and thee woman?' and 1 Pet. 2, 'As infants euen now borne, reasonable, milke without guile desireye.' We do so place, 'reasonable,' of purpose, that it may be indifferent both to infants going before, as in our Latin text: or to milke that followeth after, as in other Latin copies and in the Greeke. Io. 3 we translate, 'The spirit breatheth where he wil &c.' leauing it indifferent to signifie either the holy Ghost, or winde: which the Protestants translating, 'minde,' take away the other sense more common and vsual in the ancient fathers. We translate Luc. 8,

23, 'They were filed,' not adding of our owne, 'with water,' to mollifie the sentence, as the Protestants doe, and c. 22, 'This is the chalice, the new Testament' &c, not 'This chalice is the new Testament,' likewise, Mar. 13, 'Those daies shal be such tribulation' &c, not as the Aduersaries, 'in those daies,' both our text and theirs being otherwise, likewise Iac. 4, 6, 'And giueth greater grace,' leauing it indifferent to the 'Scripture,' or to the 'holy Ghost,' both going before. . . .

"We adde the Greeke in the margent for diuers causes. Sometime when the sense is hard, that the learned reader may consider of it and see if he can helpe him selfe better then by our translation. "Item we adde the Latin word sometime in the margent, when either we can not fully expresse it (as Act. 8. 'They tooke order for Stevens funeral,' and, 'Al take not his word.')

or when the reader might thinke, it can not be as we translate, as, Luc. 8. 'A storme of winde descended in to the lake, and they were filled,' and, Io. 5. 'when Iesus knew that he had now a long time,' meaning, in his infirmitie.

"This precise folowing of our Latin text, in neither adding nor diminishing, is the cause why we say not in the title of the Gospels in the first page, S. Matthew, S. Mar., S. John: because it is so neither in Greeke nor Latin, though in the toppes of the leaues folowing, where we may be bolder, we adde, S. Matthew &c. to satisfie the reader: Much vnlike to the Protestants our Aduersaries, which make no scruple to leaue out the name of Paul in the title of the Epistle to the Hebrues, though it be in euery Greeke booke which they translate. And their most authorised English Bibles leaue out (Catholike) in the title of S. James Epistle and the rest, which were famously knowen in the primitiue Church by the name of 'Catholicæ Epistolæ,' Euseb. hist. Eccl. li. 2, c. 22.

"Item we giue the Reader in the places of some importance, another reading in the margent, specially when the Greeke is agreeable to the same.

"We binde not our selues to the pointes of any one copie, print, or edition of the vulgar Latin, in places of no controuersie, but folow the pointing most agreeable to the Greeke and to the fathers commentaries.

"We translate sometime the word that is in the Latin margin, and not that in the text, when by the Greeke or the fathers we see it is a manifest fault of the writers heretofore, that mistooke one word for an other.

"Thus we haue endeououred by al meanes to satisfie the indifferent reader, and to helpe his vnderstanding euery way, both in the text, and by Annotations: and withal to deale most sincerely before God and man, in translating and expounding the most sacred text of the holy Testament. Fare wel good Reader, and if we profit the any whit by our poore paines, let us for Gods sake be partakers of thy deuout praier, and together with humble and contrite hart cal upon our Sauour Christ to cease these troubles and stormes of his derest spouse."

In this preface, so ingenuous and yet so reserved about their motives, so nimble in its fence and so fierce in its assault, the Rhemists laid themselves open to the castigation of their watchful opponents who were glad of the occasion, and at once seized upon it with unmeasured severity. Fulke opened upon them in the following terms¹:—

"Whoso seeth what unnecessary charge you have put your selves unto in printing this your Translation in so large a volume, may easily perceive you set it not forth for poor men's profit; and that, by so excessive price of so small a part of the whole Bible, you mean to discourage your friends from waiting for all the rest.

"As for the special consideration that procured this edition, when you do express it, we may better judge of it. In the mean time, we can conceive none other, but that which is the practice of many heretikes:—when you could not altogether suppress the knowledge of the holy Scriptures, whereby your errors are discovered; you thought it the next way for your purpose, by your partial translation as much as you could to obscure them, and by your heretical Annotations to pervert them, that the one should make them unprofitable, the other also hurtful.

"And whereas you say, 'That of old they have not ever

¹ Confutation, &c., Preface. London, 1589.

condemned all vulgar versions of the Scripture, nor generally forbidden the faithful to read them;' Let the registers of Bishops be searched, where it will appear that many have been accused and condemned as Heretics, for having, reading, or hearing the holy Scriptures in the English tongue, without any exception taken against the truth of the translation."

A portion of Cartwright's Answer to the Preface of the Rhemish New Testament was published at Edinburgh in 1602, and in it the Puritan leader thus delivers himself¹:—

"It is evident, that you permit it, not either in reverence to the Holy Scriptures, or love to the people: but rather as desperat enemies which had rather kill with it, than that the head of your gaineful errors should be stricken off by it. And it fareth altogether with you in this poynt as with men which having a naturall hatred of cheese, or of some such foode, in suche sorte as the very sight or touch of it doth offend them: yet being effamished, are content for the safetie of their lives even to eate it. For, abhorring from the Scriptures in time of your peace; when it cometh that you and your state is plunged by such as you call 'hæretickes,' you are glad to bite or nibble upon the Scriptures, if happellie you can get anything to serve the present neede.

"After that, by hiding and burning the Scriptures, by threatening and murdering of men for reading of them, they cannot attaine to the causing of such a night of ignorance, wherein they might doe all thinges without controulement: there remayned one onely engine which Satan (with all his Angels) having framed and hammered upon his lying forge, hath furnished them of. This engine is, the defacing and dis-authorizing of the Scriptures, as it were the taking from them their girdle or garter of honour, by a false surmise of corruption of them, in the languages wherein they were first written. Which abominable practice being attempted in th' Old testament by Lindanus² is now assayed in the new by the Jesuites."

¹ Pp. 6 and 92.

² Lindanus, Bishop of Ruremond, genere," Coloniae, 1558, 16mo, in which he affirms the superiority of the Latin Vulgate version over the optimo Scripturas interpretandi Hebrew and Greek Originals.

The Rhemists profess perfect integrity concerning their own work, wishing it to be "most sincere as becometh a Catholic translation." In the note at Acts xiii, 1, they say, that they might have rendered the clause, "as they were ministering," by "as they were sacrificing," or "saying masse," "but we keepe our texte as the translators of Scripture should doe most religiously." The rendering, 2 Peter i, 10, "labour the more that by good works you may secure your vocation," is faithful to the Vulgate, and the addition has a little support in some MSS. and versions.

As they deliberately chose the Vulgate¹ to translate from, they give us the reasons of their preference: Its antiquity, its editorial revision by Jerome, its commendation by Augustine, its use by the Fathers, its proclaimed authenticity by the Council of Trent, its gravity, its impartiality, the preference given to it occasionally by Beza and the Calvinists, its superiority to all other Latin translations, and in cases of discrepancy to the vulgar Greek text itself, "according to the testimony of the old scholars and divines." But critical rules and opinions are characterized by a peculiar lubricity. Their statement is that the Latin does usually agree with the Greek text, that any disagreement is often found to be coincident with some old copy, "as may be seen in Stephens' margin," and that the adversaries sometimes accept such marginal readings; that when Greek copies exhibit a different text, the Vulgate is found to agree with patristic quotations; that emendations may be resorted to if such authority be wanting, or recourse may be had to the Latin Fathers, and if, in this appeal, discrepancy should be found, the blame is to be laid to the "great diversitie and multitude" of Latin copies. So that in this easy and incoherent way of moving from post to pillar, as often as their position is felt to be untenable, the superiority of the Latin translation to the Greek original is demonstrated.

This version, however, was made by men of no small erudition, but very thorough devotees of Rome. The integrity which they

¹ A certain cardinal confessed again, lest his Latinity should be that he had gone over the Vulgate spoiled. once, but vowed never to read it

claim for themselves they deny to others. Their opponents are ever accused of translating for the purpose of falsifying the sacred text, and wilfully misinterpreting it. They do not find mere blunders in their antagonists—what they impute to Protestant scholars and critics is conscious wickedness, the making of additions, alterations, and omissions, in avowed and profane rebellion against the Divine truth. The Notes are purely polemical, as if the version had been made to furnish occasion for them. No element of charity breathes in them, no compassion for poor non-Catholics; heretics and Protestants are assailed on every page, and their sins are educed from the text, often by the most ingenious inferences, or are connected with it by an invisible film of gossamer. Fury and indignation are poured upon them, and they are overwhelmed with scathing invective, and terrible menace—exposure to the worst of penalties on earth, and unutterable retributions in the world to come. In the words of Geddes, their co-religionist, "the translation is accompanied with virulent annotations against the Protestant religion, and manifestly calculated to support a system, not of genuine catholicity, but of Transalpine Popery."

The Rhemist scholars, though they paid divine honours to the Latin text, rendered always with the Greek text before them, as their title-page asserts, as their margin proves, and as their frequent insertion of the definite article also indicates; for it is found in many places where previous translators have neglected it, as may be seen in 1 Thess. i, 3, "the charity, the enduring of the hope"; Matt. iv, 5, "the pinnacle"; xxviii, 16, "the mount"; Eph. ii, 3, "as also the rest"; Rev. vii, 13, "clothed in the white robes";—conversely, Luke ii, 9, "an angel of our Lord"; Matt. ii, 13, "an angel"; John iv, 27, "talked with a woman"; and in these three places the Authorized Version wrongly inserts the definite article; Luke xvi, 13, "cleave to one and condemn the other," a distinction to which the mere Latin could not have helped them. They did not, as has been often done, translate as a rule the genitive like an adjective of quality, as in the phrase "glorious liberty," Rom. viii, 21; "the glorious gospel," 2 Cor. iv, 4; "deceitful lusts," Eph. iv, 22; "true holiness," 24;

"our vile body," "his glorious body," Philip. iii, 21; "his mighty angels," 2 Thess. i, 7; "his dear son," Coloss. i, 13; but they keep literally "liberty of the glory," "gospel of the glory," "desires of error," "holiness of the truth," "body of our humility," "body of his glory," "angels of his power," "Son of his love." In some of these instances, not in all, the Authorized Version gives the literal rendering on the margin of the first edition. While the Rheims Version is sometimes ludicrous in consequence of the close adherence to the Vulgate, there are very many clauses in which there are happy and nicely adjusted renderings. True to their ecclesiastical beliefs, they render "presbyter" by "priest," "repent" by "do penance," "repented in sackcloth and ashes" by "done penance in haircloth and ashes," and "cup" by "chalice." By the use of "halleluiah," "hosanna," "amen," and "Belial," they justify "pasche," "parasceue," "Azymes"; their further argument being, if "proselyte" be taken why not "neophyte," if "phylacteries" why not "prepuce and Paraclete," if "anathema" why not "depositum"? How is it possible, it is asked, to express "evangelizo" but by "evangelize"? But their slavish adherence to the idiom and order of the Latin text leads often to obscurity, nay, not a few clauses are incomprehensible—if they are ambiguous and unintelligible in the Vulgate, they characteristically remain so in the translation, for face answereth to face. Many Latin terms are transferred, not rendered. Their translation, as Fuller says, "needs to be translated," for their English style is continually disfigured by foreign words.¹ Thus—

Matt. i, 17, "transmigration of Babylon"; vi, 11, "super-substantial bread"; xvi, 26, "what permutation"; xxvii, 62, "day which is after the parasceue."

Mark iii, 6, "made a consultation"; 14, "he made that twelve should be with him"; v, 35, "they come to the arch-

¹ On the back of the title-page of the first edition of the New Testament is printed the ecclesiastical license, which is called "The Censure and Approbation." Leighton, in the account of his sufferings which he endured in virtue of a sentence pronounced upon him by the High Commissioners' Court, says, "the censure was to cut my ears, slit my nose," &c.

synagogue"; xiv, 27, "scandalized"; xv, 46, "wrapped him in the sindon."

Luke i, 6, "walking in all the commaundements and justifications of our Lord"; 67, "replenished with the Holy Ghost"; iii, 14, "be content with your stipends"; iv, 40, "incontinent rising"; ix, 22, "be rejected of the ancients"; 46, "there entered a cogitation into them"; xiv, 32, "sending a legacie"; xii, 11, "magistrates and potestates"; xx, 26, "they could not reprehend his word"; xxii, 7, "the day of the Azymes came, . . . that the pasche should be killed"; 12,³ "a great refectorie adorned"; 18, "I will not drink of the generation of the vine"; 42, "transfer this chalice from me"; xxiii, 14, "as averting the people"; 24, "adjudged their petition to be done."

John ii, 11,⁴ "What to me and thee woman?" 19, "dissolve this temple"; iii, 20, "that his works may not be controuled" (checked or censured); vii, 5, "Scenopégia was at hand"; xix, 42, "a new monument." (Annot. by Luther, 1542)

Acts i, 2, "he was assumed"; xxi, 21, "zelatours"; xxii, 3, "an emulatur of the law"; xxiii, 14, "by execration we have vowed."

Rom. i, 11, "some spiritual grace"; 30, "odible to God"; ii, 20, "of science and of veritie"; 25, "if thou be a prevaricator of the law, thy circumcision is become prepuce"; iii, 25, "hath prepared a propitiation"; viii, 18, "I think that the passions of this time are not condigne to the glory to come"; 39, "from the charitie of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord";¹ xvi, 5, "their domestical church."

1 Cor. i, 8, "who will confirme you unto the end without crime"; v, 4, "with the vesture of our Lord Jesus"; v, 7, "purge the old leaven, that ye may be a new paste as you are Azymes"; vii, 6, "I say this by indulgence"; 18, "let him not procure prepuce"; vii, 19, "prepuce is nothing, but the observation of the commaundements of God"; x, 11, "written to our correption"; 13, "that you may be able to sustain"; 18, "they that eat the hosts"; xi, 4, "dishonesteth his head"; xiv, 23, "vulgar persons or infidels."

¹ It may be noted that the pro-Lord, "our Lord," just "as we say noun is always prefixed to the term our lady." See note 1 Tim. vi.

2 Cor. iii, 18, "with face revealed"; iv, 10, "bearing about in our body the mortification of Jesus"; vi, 6, "long-animitie"; vii, 1, "from all iniquation of the flesh and spirit"; viii, 19, "ordained . . . fellow of our peregrination"; x, 4, "unto the destruction of munitions"; xi, 8, "taking a stipend"; xiii, 3, "seek you an experiment of him that speaketh in me, Christ."

Gal. i, 13, "expugned it"; v, 4, "evacuated from Christ"; 3, "every man circumciding himself"; 21, "ebrieties, commensations";¹ vi, 1, "if a man be preoccupied in any fault."

Eph. i, 9, "sacrament of his will"; ii, 2, "children of diffidence"; 19, "the domesticals of God"; iii, 6, "concorporate and comparticipant"; 11, "princes and potestates in the celestials"; 11, "according to the prefinition of worlds"; iv, 16, "by all juncture of subministration"; 30, "contristate not the holy spirit of God"; v, 32, "this is a great sacrament"; vi, 12, "against the rectours of the world, of this darkness against the spirituals of wickednes in the celestials."

Philip. ii, 9, "every knee bow of the celestials, terrestrials, and infernals"; iii, 10, "the societie of his passions."

Col. i, 18, "in all things holding the primacy"; 27, "the glory of this sacrament in the Gentiles."

1 Tim. i, 7, "doctors of the law"; vi, 20, "keep the *depositum*."

2 Tim. i, 14, "keep the good *depositum*"; ii, 4, "entangleth himself with secular businesses"; iv, 6, "the time of my resolution² is at hand."

Titus i, 16, "incredulous"; iii, 3, "serving divers desires and voluptuousnesses . . . odible."

Philemon 6, "in the agnition of all good."

Heb. ii, 17, "repropitiate the sins"; iii, 13, "obdurate with the fallacie of sinne"; v, 9, "being consummate"; 11, "great

¹ Strype relates that Cranmer Cranmer, vol. II, p. 207, Oxford, sent visitors to All Souls, Oxford, 1848, because of scandalous reports of "their computations, ingurgitations, enormous and excessive this my tabernacle." Works, VI, p. commensations." Memorials of 418, ed. David Laing, Edin., 1864.

² John Knox uses the same term, "daylie luyking for the resolution of

speech and inexplicable"; ix, 1, "justifications of service"; 2, "proposition of loaves"; 3, "Sancta Sanctorum"; 28, "to exhaust the sins of many"; xii, 2, "sustained the cross, contemning confusion"; xiii, 7, "your prelates"; 16, "with such hostes God is premerited."

James i, 17, "with whom is no transmutation"; 27, "pupilles and widowes"; ii, 7, "the good name that is invocated upon you."

1 Peter i, 2, "according to the prescience of God"; 5, "by the vertue of God are kept"; iii, 20, "incredulous sometime"; iv, 12, "think it not strange in the fervour which is to you for a tentation"; 13, "but communicating with the passions of Christ"; v, 5, "insinuate humilitie one to another."

2 Peter i, 3, "his own proper glory and virtue"; 7, "love of the fraternitie"; ii, 13, "coinquinations and spots"; iii, 13, "in which justice inhabiteth."

1 John iii, 1, "behold what manner of charitie the Father hath given us"; iv, 3, "every spirit that dissolveth Jesus is not of God"; 16, "God is charitie."¹

3 John 9, "he that loveth to bear the primacy among them."

Jude i, 4, "were long ago prescribed unto this judgment, . . . denying the only Dominator."

Rev. i, 10, "Dominical day"; ii, 14, "to cast a scandal before"; iii, 17, "a miser and miserable"; xiv, 11, "if any man take the character of his name"; xxii, 14, "that wash their stoles"; 17, "let him take the water of life gratis."

Some phrases are not so cramped and narrow as those given, or as that which occurs in Romans xiv, 19, "Therefore the things that are of peace let vs pursue: and the things that are of edifying one toward an other let vs keepe." And there are some freer renderings—Matt. viii, 29,² "What is between us?"

¹ "I did ever allow the discrecion and tenderness of the Rhemish translation on this point, that finding in the original the word ἀγάπη, and never ἔρως, do ever translate 'charity' and never 'love,' because of the in-differency and equivocation of the word with impure love." Lord Bacon, Pacification of the Church, Works, vol. VII, p. 81, ed. B. Montague, London, 1827.

² "Quid nobis et tibi?"

ix, 2,¹ "have a good heart"; xxi, 41,² "he will bring to naught"; Mark ii, 1,³ "after some days"; 15,⁴ "he sat at meat"; Luke xviii, 14,⁵ "more than he"; John xii, 2,⁶ "them that sat at the table"; 6,⁷ "not because he cared for the poor"; Acts ix, 11,⁸ "Loe, here I am, Lord"; x, 10,⁹ "to take somewhat"; xvii, 4,¹⁰ "that served God"; 5,¹¹ "of the rascal sort."

They explain some of the words used in a stricter Latin or Low Latin sense: as "calumniate," to use violent oppression,¹² Luke iii, 14; "contristate," to make heavy and sad, Eph. iv, 30; i, 6, "grace wherein he hath gratified us, made gracious"; "prevarication" is transgression, as in Rom. ii, 23; "prefinition" means a determination before, as in Eph. iii, 11.

There are also not a few familiar Saxon phrases in the version—the English instincts of the translators were not wholly quenched or perverted:

Matt. ix, 24, "the multitude keeping a sturre"; x, 25, "goodman of the house"; xiv, 9, "the king was stricken sad"; xviii, 28, "throttled him"; xx, 1, "work man"; xxi, 44, "it shal al to bruise him"; xxv, 27, "bankers"; xxvii, 5, "hanged himself with an halter."

Mark v, 36, "saith to the Archsynagogue"; 39, "why make you this a doe? the wench is not dead"; 41, "where the wench was lying"; ix, 7, "this is my son most dear."

Luke i, 65, "these things were bruited over all the hill countrie"; ii, 3, "all want to be enrolled"; 44, "kinsfolk and acquaintance"; viii, 22, "let us strike over the lake"; 33, "the herd . . . was stifled"; 35, "well in his wits"; xi, 25, "swept with a besom and trimmed"; xiii, 34, "as the bird doth her brood"; xv, 8, "what woman having ten grotes

¹ "Confide."

² "Male perdet."

³ "Post dies."

⁴ "Accumberet."

⁵ "Ab illo."

⁶ "Discumbentibus."

⁷ "Non quia de egenis pertinebat ad eum."

⁸ "Ecce ego, Domine."

⁹ "Gustare."

¹⁰ "Colentibus."

¹¹ "De Vulgo."

¹² On "calumniate" in this sense see the remarks of Cardinal Wiseman, Works, vol. I, p. 86.

if she leese one grote"; xvi, 2, "bailiffe"; 4, "bailieship"; 9, "when you fail"; xviii, 2, "feared not God and of man made no account"; xx, 18, "every one that falleth upon this stone shall be quashed, and upon whom it shall fall, it shall break him to powder."

John iv, 5, "beside the maner that Jacob gave to his sonne"; viii, 44, "a mankiller from the beginning."

Acts ii, 30, "sit upon his seat"; v, 7, "not knowing what was chaunced"; viii, 2, "took order for Steven's funeral"; xvii, 18, "this wordsower."

1 Cor. viii, 1, "knowledge puffeth up," after the Genevan of 1560; xiv, 35, "it is a foul thing for a woman to speak in the church"; xv, 54, "this mortal hath done on immortalitye."

2 Cor. v, 4, "overclothed"; xii, 20, "stomakings."

Col. iii, 10, "doing on the new [man]."

1 Thes. iv, 6, "that no man ouergoe . . . his brother."

2 Tim. iii, 13, "erring and driving into error."

Heb. xii, 12, "stretche up the slacked handes"; 16, "for one dish of meat sold his first-birth-rightes."

1 Peter ii, 12, "misreport of you"; iii, 3, "whose trimming."

2 Peter ii, 4, "with the ropes of Hell being drawn down into Hell"; iii, 8, "my dearest."

Rev. ii, 17, "a white counter."

But the Rhemist translators, though they make no mention of previous translations, kept before them both the Genevan and the Bishops', and have supplied not a few good renderings which were thankfully accepted by the revisers of King James. They have enriched the vocabulary of the Authorized Version. From them came "hymn" in Matt. xxvi, 30; and "blessed" in 26; "decease" in Luke ix, 31; "reprobate," Rom. i, 28; "impenitent," ii, 5; "commendeth," v, 8; and in the Epistle of James i, 5, "upbraideth not"; 5, "nothing doubting," "the engrafted word"; 21, "bridleth his tongue," the previous versions having "refraineth"; "unction," 1 John ii; and the word "mystery," "at his own charges," 1 Cor. ix, 7; "contemptible," 2 Cor. x, 10; 2 Tim. iii, 6, "silly"—the Bishops' having "simple" in brackets (*mulierculas*). They

have given us "confess" for "knowledge," "propitiation," "seduce," "have confidence," "stumbling," and "understanding"—all these in the first Epistle of John, and all directly from the Vulgate. Such Latin terms as "lucre," "superfluitie," "concupiscence," "tradition," "tribulation," "salute," &c., were in the older versions. They have also a special merit in preserving uniformity of rendering—the want of which is a peculiar and pervading blemish in the Authorized Version. Many examples will afterwards be adduced under the head of Revision. When Gregory Martin remarked on the absence of uniformity, Fulke says little more in reply than this: "For my part I was never of counsel with any that translated the Scriptures into English, and therefore it is possible that I cannot sufficiently express what moved the translators so to vary in the exposition of one and the same word."¹ So closely do the Rhemists adhere to their text that, as they say themselves, they do not in the titles to the Gospels call the evangelists, St. Matthew, St. Mark, &c., though they do so "on the tops of the leaves following to satisfie the reader." Had these scholarly Englishmen not been warped by their ecclesiastical prejudices, they would have issued a translation of the Vulgate greatly more exact and felicitous than any of those which their predecessors had given of the Greek text.

The Rheims New Testament was once appealed to and rejected in very tragic circumstances. On the evening before her execution in Fotheringay Castle, the unfortunate Queen of Scots, laying her hand solemnly on a copy that happened to be on her work table, took a solemn oath of innocence, when the Earl of Kent at once interposed that the book on which she had sworn was false, and that her oath was therefore of no value. Her answer was prompt and decided—"Does your lordship suppose that my oath would be better, if I swore on your translation in which I do not believe?"²

¹ Defence, p. 89.

Douairière de France," reprinted in

² La Mort de la Reyne d'Escoce, Jebb's Collection, vol. II, p. 616.

CHAPTER XLII.

THE Old Testament was at length published at Douai in 1609-10.

"The Holie Bible Faithfully Translated into English out of The Avthentical Latin. Diligently conferred with the Hebrew, Greeke, and other Editions in diuers languages. With Argvments of the Bookes, and Chapters: Annotations: Tables: and other helps, for better vnderstanding of the text; for discoverie of Corruptions in some latter translations: and for clearing controuersies in Religion. By the English College of Doway. Spiritu Sancto inspirati, locuti sunt sancti Dei homines. 2 Pet. i. The holie men of God spake, inspired with the Holy Ghost. Printed at Doway by Lawrence Kellam, at the signe of the holie Lambe. M.D.C.X." Two volumes. This Bible has neither maps nor plates. A brief address on the last page says: "We have already found some faults escaped, but fearing there be more, and the whole volume being ere long to be examined again, we pray the courteous reader to pardon all and amend them as they occur." After the second book of Maccabees it is stated: "The prayer of Manasses, with the second and third books of Esdras, extant in most Latin and Vulgare Bibles, are here placed after al the Canonical books of the old Testament: because they are not received into the canon of Diuine Scriptures by the Catholique Church." The translation had been prepared many years previously, even before the appearance of the New Testament, but it was not published "for lack of good meanes," and, as is confessed, "our poor estate in banishment." It had also been finished before corrected editions of

the Vulgate were published under Pope Sixtus V (1590) and Pope Clement VIII (1592), and therefore it was again conferred before publication "and conformed to the most perfect Latin edition." The translators refer incidentally to our Authorized Bible "as a new edition which we have not yet seen." In the address "to the right well-beloved English reader" topics akin to those discussed in the preface to the New Testament are briefly referred to. The Annotations and Tables were prepared by Dr. Thomas Worthington, elected president of the college in 1599, but he resigned office to Kellison in 1613, and died an Oratorian in 1626. The notes are not so numerous as those in the New Testament, with the exception of Genesis and Psalms. A few sentences of the address prefixed to the Old Testament are subjoined, since, as in the case of the preface to the Rheims New Testament, it has fallen out of view.

"To the right wel beloved English reader grace and glory in Iesvs Christ Everlasting. At last through Gods goodness (most dearely beloved) we send you here the greater part of the Old Testament, as long since you receiued the New, faithfully translated into English. The residue is in hand to be finished: and your desire thereof shal not now (God prospering our intention) be long frustrate. As for the impediments, which hitherto haue hindered this worke they al proceeded (as many doe know) of one general cause, our poore estate in banishment. Wherein expecting better meanes, greater difficulties rather ensued. Neuertheles you wil hereby the more perceiue our feruent good wil, euer to serue you, in that we haue brought forth this Tome, in the hardest times, of aboue forty yeares, since this College was most happily begun. Wherefore we nothing doubt, but you our dearest, for whom we haue dedicated our liues, wil both pardon the long delay, which we could not preuent, and accept now this fruit of our labours, with like good affection, as we acknowledge them due, and offer the same vnto you. . . .

"But here another question may be proposed: Why we translate the Latin text, rather then the Hebrew, or Greeke, which Protestants preferre as the fountaine tongs,

wherin holie Scriptures were first written? To this we answer that if indeed those first pure Editions were now extant, or if such as be extant were more pure then the Latin, we would also preferre such fountaines before the riuers, in whatsoever they should be found to disagree. But the ancient best learned Fathers and Doctours of the Church, doe much complaine, and testifie to vs, that both the Hebrew and Greeke Editions are foully corrupted by Iewes, and Heretikes, since the Latin was truly translated out of them, whiles they were more pure; and that the same Latin hath been farre better conserued from corruptions. So that the old Vulgate Latin Edition hath been preferred and vsed for most authentical aboue a thousand and three hundred yeares.

. . . Neither doe we fly vnto this old Latin text for more aduantage: For besides that it is free from partiality, as being most ancient of al Latin copies, and long before the particular Controuersies of these dayes began, the Hebrew also and the Greek when they are truly translated, yea and Erasmus his Latin, in sundry places proue more plainly the Catholike Roman doctrine, then this which we rely vpon. So that Beza and his followers take also exception against the Greeke, when Catholikes alledge it against them. Yea the same Beza preferreth the old Latin Version before al others and freely testifieth, that the old Interpreter translated religiously. What then doe our countrimen, that refuse this Latin, but depriue themselues of the best, and yet al this while, haue set forth none, that is allowed by al Protestants for good or sufficient?

"How wel this is done the learned may iudge, when by mature conference they shal haue made trial thereof. And if any thing be mistaken, we will (as stil we promise) gladly correct it. Those that translated it about thirty yeares since, were wel known to the world, to haue been excellent in the tongs, sincere men, and great Diuines. Only one thing we haue done touching the text, whereof we are especially to giue notice: That whereas heretofore in the best Latin Editions there remained many places differing in words, some also in sense, as in long process of time the writers erred in their copies, now lately by

the care and diligence of the Church, those diuers readings were maturely and iudiciously examined and conferred with sundry the best written and printed books, and so resoluēd vpon, that al which before were left in the margent, are either restored into the text, or els omitted ; so that now none such remain in the margent. For which cause we have againe conferred this English translation, and conformed it to the most perfect Latin Edition. Where yet by the way we must giue the vulgar reader to vnderstand, that very few or none of the former varieties touched Controuersies of this time. So that this recognition is no way suspicious of partiality, but is meerly done for the more secure conseruation of the true text, and more ease and satisfaction of such, as otherwise should haue remained more doubtful.

“Now for the strictness obserued in translating some words, or rather the not translating of some, which is in more danger to be disliked, we doubt not but the discrete learned reader, deeply weighing and considering the importance of sacred words, and how easily the translatour may misse the sense of the Holy Ghost, wil hold that which is here done for reasonable and necessary. We have also the example of the Latin and Greeke, where some words are not translated, but left in Hebrew, as they were first spoken and written ; which seeing they could not, or were not conuenient to be translated into Latin or Greeke, how much lesse could they or was it reason to turne them into English ? S. Augustin also yieldeth to a reason, exemplifying in the words ‘amen’ and ‘alleluia, for the more sacred authoritie thereof,’ which doubtless is the cause why some ‘names of solemne feasts, sacrifices,’ and other holie things are ‘reserued in sacred tonges,’ Hebrew, Greeke, or Latin. Againe for necessitie, English not hauing a name or sufficient terme, we either keep the word as we find it, or only turne it to our English termination, because it would otherwise require manie words in English to signifie one word of another tongue. In which cases, we commonly put the explication in the margent. Briefly our Apologie is easie against English Protestants ; because they also reserue some words in the original tongues, not translated into English,

as ‘Sabbath, Ephod, Pentecost, Proselyte,’ and some others. . . . It more importeth, that nothing be wittingly and falsly translated for aduantage of doctrine in matter of faith. Wherein as we dare boldly auouch the sinceritie of this Translation, and that nothing is here either vntruly or obscurely done of purpose, in fauour of Catholike Roman Religion, so we can not but complaine, and challenge English Protestants for corrupting the text, contrarie to the Hebrew and Greeke, which they profess to translate for the more shew and maintaining of their peculiar opinions against Catholikes : As is proued in the ‘Discouerie of manifold corruptions.’ . . .

“With this then we wil conclude most deare (we speake to you al, that vnderstand our tongue, whether you be of contrarie opinions in faith, or of mundane feare participate with an other Congregation, or professe with vs the same Catholike Religion) to you al we present this worke : daily beseeching God Almightye, the Diuine Wisdom, Eternal Goodnes, to create, illuminate, and replenish your spirits, with his Grace, that you may attaine eternal Glorie, euery one in his measure, in those many Mansions, prepared and promised by our Sauour in his Fathers house. Not only to those which first received and followed his Diuine doctrine, but to all that should afterwards belieue in him, and keep the same precepts.

“From the English College in Doway, the Octaues of Al Saints. 1609. ‘The God of patience and comfort give you to be of one mind, one towards an other in Iesvs Christ ; that of one mind, with one mouth you may glorifie God.’”

Latinized English in imitation of the Vulgate, pervades this Old Testament as fully as it does the New Testament, and there are renderings so obscure as to be nearly unintelligible. A few examples may be given from the earlier Psalms. The Psalter, however, had been sadly trifled with. Originally the Latin psalter was a translation not from Hebrew but from Greek, and that translation from Greek being cursorily revised by Jerome, at the request of Pope Damasus, became the Roman psalter, and a second and more thorough revision, undertaken at the request of Paula and Eustochium, and made by the help of Origen’s Hexaplar text, became the Gallican psalter.

These revisions are very different in merit from Jerome's own direct translation of the original Hebrew, which, however, was not allowed to find a place in the Vulgate, much in the same way as the Psalms of the Great Bible keep their position still in the Book of Common Prayer. Many of the extraordinary renderings are in this way accounted for.¹ The following are specimens; and to facilitate comparison on the part of those who have not a Douai Bible at hand, the notation of chapters and verse is given not according to it, but according to our common version. After the ninth Psalm, the notation of Psalms differs by one in the Douai version, but coalesces again at Psalm cxlvii, and the title of the psalm is usually reckoned the first verse of it.

Psalms ii, 12, "apprehend discipline"; iv, 6, "the light of thy countenance, O Lord, is signed upon us"; viii, 5, "thou hast minished him a little less than angels"; xvi, 3, "he hath made all my willes mervelous in them"; 11, "delectations on thy right hand"; xvii, 5, "perfitte my passes in thy pathes"; 14, "their belly is filled of thy secrets"; xviii, 45, "the children of aliens are inueterated"; xxiii, 5, "thou hast fattened my head with oil, and my chalice inebriating how goodlie is it"; 6, "in longitude of days"; xxxv, 1, "overthrow them that impugne me"; 16, "they were dissipated and not compunct"; xxxviii, 8, "my loins are filled with illusions"; xxxix, 12, "I have fainted in reprehensions"; xlvii, 9,¹⁰ "strong gods of the earth are exceedingly advanced"; xl^y, 12, "there was no multitude in the exchanges of them"; lxiv, 7, "children's arrows are made their wounds"; lxv, 11, "inebriate her rivers; in her dropps she shall rejoice springing";¹⁴ 14, "which did take sweet meats together with me"; lvi, 14, "from the height of the day I shall fear"; lxviii, 10, "voluntarie rayne shalt thou sepeparate"; 16, "a moun-tane crudded as cheese, a fatte mountane"; 27, "Benjamin, a young man in excess of mind"; lxxii, 16, "there shall be a firmament in the earth, in the tops of the mountains"; lxxvi, 10, "the cogitation of man shall confess to thee, and the remains of the cogitation shall keep festival day to thee"; lxxxvi^f, 6, "our Lord will declare in Scriptures of peoples."

¹ Kaulen, Geschichte der Vulgata, Mainz, 1868.

Isaiah xiii, 22, "and the Syrach owls shall answer, and mermaids in the temples of pleasure."

There are swarms of other instances:—

Numbers xx, 24, "he was incredulous to my mouth"; 26, "and when thou hast unvested the father of his vesture, thou shalt revest therewith Eleazar his son."

Deut. xvi, 2, "thou shalt immolate the Phasc to our Lord thy God"; xvii, 18, "he shall copie to himselfe the Deuteronomie of this law"; xxvii, 7, "thou shalt immolate pacifique hostes"; xxxiii, 14, "of the pomes of the fruits of the sunne and moone."

Idiomatic and pithy renderings are, however, to be found—

Gen. ii, 22, "built the rib into a woman"; v, 24, "Enoch was seen no more"; vii, 24, "the waters held on above the earth an 150 days."

Exod. iii, 14, "I am which am."

Num. xx, 19, "we will go by the beaten way."

Judges viii, 34, "called his esquire"; xix, 17, "saw the man sitting with his fardels."

Job viii, 12, "or a seggie place grow without water?" ix, 17, "in a hurle wind shal he break me"; xii, 18, "he looseth the belt of kings"; xv, 27, "fatnes hath covered his face, and from his sides there hangeth tallow"; xl, 13, "his bones are as pipes of brass"; xli, 15, "compact as the smith's stithie."

Psalms lxvi, 15, "oxen with bueke goats"; lxvii, 4, "let the just make merrie"; lxviii, 11, "our Lord shall give the word to them that evangelize with great power"—power, as the Hebrew shows, meaning host or army—but the Rhemists took it as signifying "ability to work miracles."

Isaiah liii, 5, "with the waile of his stripe we are healed."

Jerem. viii, 22, "is there noe rosen in Galaad?"

Amos ii, 13, "behold I will screake under you as a wayne sreaketh loden with hay."

The note to Psalm xli, 3, is "Therefore all Catholics may assuredly know that the whole church cannot fail, though very many as now in England and very eminent persons, as some noblemen and some priests, have revolted."

There are some translations beyond common comprehension, but so are the common Latin text and the Greek version which it represents:—

2 Chron. i, 13, "King Solomon came from the excels of Gabaon"; xxxiii, 3, "he reedified the excelses"; 6, "through fire to the Valebennom."

Job ix, 13, "under whom they stoop that carry the world"; xxi, 33, "he hath been sweet to the gravel of Cocytus"; xxvi, 13, "his spirit has adorned the heavens, and his hand being the midwife"; xxxiv, 18, "Apostata, that calleth dukes impious."

Psalms l, 5, "his saints, . . . which ordaine his testament above sacrifices"; lviii, 10, "before your thorns did understand the old briar"; xc, 9, "our years shall be considered as a spyder. . . . because mildness is come upon us, and we shall be chastised"; xci, 6, "thou shalt not be afraid of business walking in darkness, of invasion and the midday devil"—all according to the Vulgate.

Many verses in the Psalter, singly or in groups, have a comment after them, and at Psalm liv, 3, we read, "barbarous highland men have betrayed the place."

A revision of the Psalms (Psalms of David translated from the Vulgate, 1700) was made by John Caryl, secretary at St. Germain's to the queen of James II; and the volume has the approbation of Dr. Betham, serenissimi principis Walliae Preceptor—that is, tutor to the Pretender. The reason and nature of his work are thus given by him:—"So it is that in some places the Latine Text of the Psalms rigorously translated word by word would yeeld a scarce intelligible sense in the language into which it is translated: and wher that happens, it seems reasonable that such a latitude and liberty should be allow'd as is necessary to make the sense of the Text, as it is generally understood by the most approv'd authors, intelligible to the reader, especially in a Translation intended only for the privat devotions of Lay persons."

The theological notes of the entire version—Old and New Testament—are Romish without disguise:—

Matt. xxv, "Heaven is the reward of good works."

2 Tim. iv, "The parable also of the men sent into the vineyard proveth that heaven is our own right, bargained for and wrought for, and accordingly paid unto us as our hire at the day of judgment."

Heb. x, 21, "Adoration may be done to creatures or to God at and before a creature," the rendering in the text being, "adored the top of his rod."

Luke xi, "Alms extinguish sin—they deliver from death"; xii, 21, "By goods bestowed upon the poor, he hath store of merit, many alms-men's prayers procuring mercy for him at the day of his death"; xvi, 28, "If the damned had care of their friends . . . much more have the saints and saved persons. And if those in hell have means to express their cogitations and desires, and be understood by Abraham, much rather may the living pray to the saints, and be heard of them."

Rev. vi, "Saints be present at their tombs and reliques"; xvii, "putting heretics to death is not to shed the blood of the saints"; "Heresy and apostacy from the Catholic faith punishable by death." The woman touching the hem of Christ's garment is held out as a warrant for the "devout touching of holy reliques," Mark v. The note to Matt. vi, 24, explains the "two masters" to be God and Baal, Christ and Calvin, Masse and Communion, &c.

There is appended to the New Testament a list of fifty-five words "not familiar to the vulgar reader," but many of them are now in common use, as abstracted, acquisition, adulterate, advent, allegory, calumniate, catechize, condign, evangelize, eunuch, holocaust, gratis, invoke, issue, prescience, resuscitate, victims. Some of the other terms have not become familiar as, assist in a sacerdotal sense; assumption for Christ's ascension, dominical, donary, gratified meaning made gracious, hosts for sacrifices. There are other Latin terms in the list which have occurred in the specimens already given, and these have not been naturalized. To prove that St. Peter was in Rome, they hold that by Babylon, in his first Epistle, v, 13, is meant the Italian capital, and they shut their eyes to the consequences of such an interpretation. But they notify that Protestants and Calvinists are the forerunners of Antichrist.

How this Catholic Bible, with its version and its notes, struck shrewd and hostile observers, may be seen in these sentences of Fulke's Dedication of his Defence to the Queen: "Among the inestimable benefits, wherewith Almighty God hath wonderfully blessed this your majesty's most honourable and prosperous government, it is not to be numbered among the least, that under your most gracious and Christian protection the people of your highness' dominions have enjoyed the most necessary and comfortable reading of the holy scriptures in their mother tongue and native language. Which exercise, although it hath of long time, by the adversaries of him that willett the scriptures to be searched (especially those of our nation) been accounted little better than an heretical practice; and treatises have been written, pretending to shew great inconvenience of having the holy scriptures in the vulgar tongue; yet now at length perceiving they cannot prevail to bring in that darkness and ignorance of God's most sacred word and will therein contained, whereby their blind devotion, the daughter of ignorance, as they themselves profess, was wont to make them rulers of the world, they also at the last are become translators of the New Testament into English. In which, that I speak nothing of their insincere purpose, in leaving the pure fountain of the original verity, to follow the crooked stream of their barbarous vulgar Latin translation, which (beside all other manifest corruptions) is found defective in more than an hundred places, as your majesty, according to the excellent knowledge in both the tongues wherewith God hath blessed you, is very well able to judge; and to omit even the same book of their translation, pestered with so many annotations, both false and undutiful, by which, under colour of the authority of holy scriptures, they seek to infect the minds of the credulous readers with heretical and superstitious opinions, and to alienate their hearts from yielding due obedience to your majesty and your most christian laws concerning true religion established; and that I may pass over the very text of their translation, obscured without any necessary or just cause with such a multitude of so strange and unusual terms, as to the ignorant are no less difficult to understand

than the Latin or Greek itself: yet is it not meet to be concealed, that they which neither truly nor precisely have translated their own vulgar Latin and only authentical text, have nevertheless been bold to set forth a several treatise, in which most slanderously and unjustly they accuse all our English translations of the Bible, not of small imperfections and oversights committed through ignorance or negligence, but of no less than most foul dealing in partial and false translations, wilful and heretical corruptions."

On the other hand, Gregory Martin attacked the rendering of the proper names in the English version in these terms:—

"Of one thing we can by no means excuse you, but it must savour vanity, or novelty, or both. As when you affect new strange words, which the people are not acquainted withal, but it is rather Hebrew to them than English. 'Against him came up Nabuchadnezzar, king of Babel,' 2 Par. xxxvi. 6, for 'Nabuchodonosor, king of the Chaldees'; 'Saneherib,' for 'Sennacherib'; 'Michaiah's prophecy,' for 'Michæa's'; 'Jehoshaphat's prayer,' for 'Josaphat's'; 'Uzza slain,' for 'Oza'; 'when Zerubbabel went about to build the temple,' for 'Zorobabel'; 'remember what the Lord did to Miriam,' for 'Marie,' Deut. xxxiv.: and in your first translation, 'Elisa,' for 'Elisæus'; 'Pekahia' and 'Pekah,' for 'Phaceia' and 'Phacee'; 'Uziah,' for 'Ozias'; 'Thiglath-peleser,' for 'Teglath-phalasar'; 'Ahaziah,' for 'Ochozias'; 'Peka, the son of Remaliahu,' for 'Phacee, the son of Romelia.' And why say you not as well 'Shelomoh,' for 'Salomon'; and 'Coresh,' for 'Cyrus,' and so alter every word from the known sound and pronunciation thereof? Is this to teach the people, when you speak Hebrew rather than English? Were it a goodly hearing (think you) to say for 'Jesus,' 'Jeshuah'; and for 'Marie,' his mother, 'Miriam'; and for 'Messias,' 'Messiach'; and 'John,' 'Jachannan'; and such like monstrous novelties? which you might as well do, and the people would understand you as well, as when your preachers say, 'Nabucadnezer, king of Babel.'"

Fulke's simple answer is, "Seeing the most of the proper names of the Old Testament were unknown to the people before

the Scripture was read in English, it was better to utter them according to the truth of their pronunciation in Hebrew, rather than after the common corruption which they had received in the Greek and Latin tongues. But as for those names which were known unto the people out of the New Testament, as Jesus, John, Mary, &c., it had been folly to have taught men to sound them otherwise than after the Greek declination, in which we find them."¹

The Rheims translators and divines attack all the English versions. Robert Parsons, *alias* John Howlett, in giving "Reasons why Catholics refuse to go to Church," alleges that "the Scripture is read there in false and shameless translations conteyning manifest and wilful corruptions." Standish, a reformer under Edward VI, and rector of Wigan, having dismissed his wife, and gone over to Rome, published, in 1554, a book of characteristic virulence, "A Treatise against the translation of the Bible into the vulgar language." Cardinal Allen, too, brands the English Bible as "falsely corrupted and deceitfully translated." Gregory Martin calls it "not indeed God's book, word, or scripture, but the devil's worde," and sums up his charges against the Protestant versions thus: "Now then to come to our purpose, such are the absurd translations of the English Bibles, and altogether like unto these: namely, when they translate 'congregation' for 'church,' 'elder' for 'priest,' 'image' for 'idol,' 'dissension' for 'schism,' 'general' for 'catholic,' 'secret' for 'sacrament,' 'overseer' for 'bishop,' 'messenger' for 'angel,' 'ambassador' for 'apostle,' 'minister' for 'deacon,' and such like: to what other end be these deceitful translations, but to conceal and obscure the name of the church and dignities thereof, mentioned in the holy scriptures; to dissemble the word 'schism' (as they do also 'heresy' and 'heretic') for fear of disgracing their schisms and heresies; to say of 'matrimony,' neither 'sacrament,' which is the Latin, nor 'mystery,' which is the Greek, but to go as far as they can possibly from the common usual and ecclesiastical words, saying, 'This is a great secret,' in favour of their heresy, that matrimony is no sacrament?"² Matthew Kellison utters the

¹ Reply, &c., pp. 588, 589.

² Fulke, pp. 218, 219.

same language as Martin—his prime reason being that the Scripture in the English tongue is not according to the sense of ancient interpreters, nor under the Church of Rome. The reply is easy, and needs not to be formally given. Cartwright, under the patronage of the Earl of Leicester, and of Walsingham who gave him a hundred pounds to purchase books, and at the request of many heads of Houses in Cambridge,¹ began an assault on the Rheims New Testament the year after its publication; but Whitgift, in the plenitude of his prerogative, interdicted him. Whitgift had always opposed Cartwright with unsleeping hostility, and in this case he allowed ecclesiastical politics and antipathies to suppress a work of national benefit. The press was not free, and episcopal supervision could put down what was not relished, and condemn a book on account of its author's unlucky antecedents. A portion of this Reply, from which an extract has been already given, was published at Edinburgh in 1602. Cartwright died in the following year, and the full volume was published in 1618. Fulke not only wrote a "Defence of Translations of the Bible,"² with overwhelming and unanswerable criticism and argument, but also "The Text of the New Testament of Jesus Christ, translated out of the vulgar Latine by the Papists of the traiterous Seminarie at Rhemes,"³ in which he tartly and truthfully criticises the translation, verse by verse. Bulkeley also took part in the controversy in an "Answer to the Rhemish preface," &c., 1588; and Whitaker, who had no sympathy with Cartwright, published against Bellarmine, in 1610, his well known "Disputation on Holy Scripture."² "In 1615, Kellison ventured to publish 'A Gagg for the Reformed Gospel,' which was answered by Dr. Richard Montagu, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, in his 'A Gagg for the New Gospel? No: a new Gagg for an old Goose, who would needes undertake to stop all Protestants' mouths for ever with 276 places out of their own English Bibles.' Bernard, rector of Batcombe, in Somersetshire, and author of a 'Thesaurus Biblicus,' published in 1626 'Rhemes against Rome:

¹ He had been Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity.

² Reprinted by the Parker Society.

³ London, 1589.

or, the removing of "The Gag of the New Gospel," and rightly placing it in the mouthes of the *Romists* by the *Rhemists*, in their English translation of the Scriptures.' 'The Rhemist priestes,' he wrote, 'for making any translation at all of the Bible into the English tongue (though out of the Vulgar Latine, though obscured by affected phrases, and distorted by their corrupt Annotations), yet are said to have bin beshrewed by their own more subtile Masters and Superiors, as having thereby layed open to the people the nakednesse and deformitie of their Romish doctrines. And thereby have I the more willingly produced the same against themselves; the power and lustre of God's Word, though clouded and disguised by their purposed obscurite and improprieties, yet competently shining forth, for their conviction, by this unwilling wounding of *Rome* by the out-workes of Rhemes."¹

The Catholic translators, while they speak of following the most perfect Latin edition, do not seem to have made use of Wycliffe. But their renderings are now and then coincident with the Genevan version, and they quote Hebrew words in the margin of the Old Testament. On the margin of almost every page of the translation, and in the notes, the heretics are attacked as Protestants or bigots, and a fragment of the following Table will show the frequency of the allusions—
"A table of certaine places of the New Testament, corrvptly translated in favour of heresies of these dayes in the English editions: especially of the yeares 1562-77-79 and 80, by order of the bookes, chapters, and verses of the same. Wherein we do not charge our aduersaries for disagreeing from the authentical Latin text (wherof much is saide in the preface) but for corrupting the Greek it selfe, which they pretende to translate.

"S. Matt., chap. i, 19, For 'a iust man,' they translate 'a righteous man': because this word 'iust' importeth that a man is iust in deede and not only so reputed. And so generally where 'iust' or 'iustice' is ioyned with good workes, they say 'righteous' and 'righteousness': yet being joined with faith, they keepe the olde termes 'iust' and 'iustice.'

¹ Cotton's Rhemes and Doway, Oxford, 1855.

"Chap. ii, 6, For 'rule' or 'gouverne' they translate 'feede' to diminishe ecclesiastical authoritie, which the Greeke word signifieth; as also the Hebrew, Mich. v, whence this is cited.

"Chap. iii, 2, 8, For 'do penance' and 'fruite worthie of penance' (which signify painful satisfaction for sinne), they translate 'repent and repentance': or 'amendment of life.'

"Chap. xvi, 18, For 'church' they translate 'congregation,' and that so continually euery where in Tindals Bible, printed againe Ann. 1562, that the worde 'Church', is not once there to be founde. Which the other Editions correcting in other places, yet in this place it remayneth corrupted, reading still 'upon this rocke I wil build my congregation,' so loath they are it should appeare how firmly the Church of Christ is founded.

"Chap. xviii, 17, The same corruption in Tind. Bib., 'Tel the congregation' and 'If he wil not heare the congregation,' for 'Tel the Church,' and 'If he wil not hear the Church.'

"Chap. xix, 11, Our Sauour speaking of continencie saith: 'Not al take this word' which they peruert thus, 'Al men can not take this word': against free-wil, and vow of chastitie.

"Chap. xxvi, 26, For 'blessed' they translate 'gaue thanks,' against the operation and efficacie of Christes blessing.

"S. Mark, chap. x, 52, For 'thy faith had made thee safe' speaking of corporal sight geuen to the blind, they translate 'thy faith hath saued thee,' to make it seeme that iustification and saluation is by only faith.

"Chap. xiv, 22, For 'blessing,' they saye 'geuing thanks,' as Matt. xxvi, 26.

"S. Luke, chap. i, 6, For 'iust' and 'iustifications' they translate, 'righteous' and 'ordinances.'

"i. 6, For 'Haile ful of grace,' they translate 'Haile thou that art in high fauour,' and 'Haile thou that art freely beloued': though Tindal said 'Haile ful of grace,' the 'Aue Marie' being not then banished as since it is.

"Chap. iii, 8, For 'penance,' they say 'repentance,' as before, Mat. iii, 2, and 8.

"Chap. viii, 48, For 'thy faith hath made thee safe' (to wit from corporal infirmitie) they translate, 'thy faith hath saued thee.'"

"viii, 50, For 'beleue only and she shal be safe,' they say 'beleue only and she shal be saued': in fauour of the forsaid heresie of only faith: neither marking that this safetie pertaineth to the bodie, nor that it is attributed to the faith of an other, and not of the partie restored.

"Chap. xviii, 42, For 'thy faith hath made thee whole' or 'safe,' they saie, as in the former places, 'thy faith hath saued thee.'"

"Chap. xxii, 20, Beza (whom the English Protestantes herein defend) condemneth the Greeke text (which he confessest to be the same in al copies) because by it the relatiue, 'which,' must needes be referred to the Chalice, and so proueth the real presence of Christs bloude in the Chalice.

"S. John, chap. i, 12, For 'he gave them powre to be made the sonnes of God,' Beza and his folowers translate 'he gaue them the dignitie' (others say 'the prerogative') to be the sonnes 'of God': against free-wil.

"Chap. ix, 22 and 35, For 'put out of the Synagogue' they translate 'excommunicate': as though the Catholike Churches excommunication of heretikes, from the societie and participation of the faithful, were like to that exterior putting out of the Synagogue, of such as confessed Christ.

"Chap. xiii, 16, For 'Apostle' they translate 'messenger': turning an Ecclesiastical word, into the original and prophane signification."

The second edition of the New Testament was "set forth" in 1600, "by the same college now returned to Doway," Antwerp, Daniel Veruliet. It contains a table of heretical corruptions, and at the end of it stands the remark—"The blessed confessor, Bishop Tunstal, noted no less than two thousand corruptions in Tindal's translation, in the New Testament only. Thereby, as by these few here cited for example, the indifferent reader may see, how untruly the English Bibles are commended to the people for the pure Word of God." A third edition appeared at the same place in 1621, and a fourth in 1633

—probably at Rouen—a reprint of the edition of 1600. A second edition of the Old Testament was published in 1635, and no other edition of it was printed for 115 years. Later editions were revised by Haydock, Lingard, Kenrick, Withan, Nary, Challoner, and others; and the copies now in use have been toned down and brought into considerable harmony with our current Bibles. The greatest changes were introduced in Dr. Challoner's edition. Nary explains his motive in his preface: "We have no Catholick translation of the Scripture in the English tongue, but the Doway Bible, and the Rhemish Testament, which have been done now more than an hundred years since: the language whereof is so old, the words in many places so obsolete, the orthography so bad, and the translation so very literal, that in a number of places it is unintelligible, and all over so grating to the ears of such as are accustomed to speak, in a manner, another language, that most people will not be at the pains of reading them. Besides, they are so bulky, that they cannot conveniently be carried about for publick devotion; and so scarce and dear, that the generality of people neither have, nor can procure them for their private use. To supply all these defects, I have endeavoured to make this New Testament speak the English tongue now used, as near as the many Hebraisms wherewith it abounds, and which (in my opinion) ought never to be altered where they can be rendered so as to be intelligible, would allow. I have taken all the care imaginable to keep as close to the letter as the English will permit; and where the Latin phrase would prove unintelligible in the English, a word, or two or more, must be added to make the sense clear."¹ "A New Version of the Four Gospels," "by a Catholic," was published in 1836 anonymously—the author being the well-known historian Dr. Lingard. The volume has no dedication prefixed, and is not accompanied or commended by any approbation granted by the ecclesiastical authorities of the translator's own church. It is not, however, a revision of the Rheims, as it cuts deeply into its English, and is apparently in many places taken from the Greek, and not from the Latin Vulgate. Though his

¹ Cotton, p. 299.

"History" shows that the author was a very decided Catholic, he has in the translation given "repent," for "do penance"; "bondman," for "servant"; "Messiah," for "Christ"; "Good-tidings," for "Gospel"; "tax-gatherer," for "publican"; "fiends," for "devils"; "figures," for "proverbs"; "announce," for "preach"; "verily," for "amen"; "causes of offence," for "scandals"; and "righteousness," for "justice." About his notes Dr. Lingard warns: "It may be proper to inform the reader, that the notes, which are appended to the text in the following pages, are not of a controversial character. Their object is the elucidation of obscure passages, or the explication of allusions to national customs, or the statement of the reasons which have induced the translator to differ occasionally from preceding interpreters. Many of these he has consulted, though he has not thought proper to load his pages with references to their works."¹ The translation was reviewed by Cardinal Wiseman, and faintly praised; though in the article the whole subject of revision is discussed with great ability, and his judgment about the Bible of his church is not extreme: "To call it any longer the Doway or Rhemish version is an abuse of terms. It has been altered and modified till scarcely any verse remains as it was originally published; and so far as simplicity and energy of style are concerned, the changes are in general for the worse"—the truly papal conclusion being²: "The impression on the reader's mind, after having perused this edition, must be, that Christianity never depended, for its code or evidences, upon the compilation of these documents [the Gospels], and that they never could have been intended for a rule of faith."³

The old Latin Bible or Vulgate still lives in the midst of us, for we owe to it all our Christian terms ending in "ation," and nearly all the distinctive words of our theological vocabulary—as person, essence, scripture, lecture, sermon, text,

¹ Cotton, Rhemes, and Doway, p. 137. ³ Collations of these editions may be seen in Archdeacon Cotton's

² Dublin Review, April, 1837. "Rhemes and Doway," Oxford, Reprinted in Wiseman's Essays, vol. 1855. 1, p. 73-75, London, 1853.

grace, adoption, repentance, spirit, glory, satisfaction, conversion, sacrament, regeneration, justification, sanctification, redemption, privilege, election, eternity, predestination, communion, congregation, discipline, missionary.¹

The influence of the Latin church is also very apparent still in the nomenclature of even Protestant Presbyterian Scotland. The chairman of a presbytery or synod is called its "moderator"; he who presides when a minister is chosen "moderates" in a call; he who executes a commission given him by a church court "obtemperates" their decision; the elders in a church form its "session"; the chairman of the board of secular management is the "preses"; the Lord's Supper is the "sacrament," the previous discourse is the "Action sermon," and the bread and wine the "elements"; the leader of the psalmody is the "precentor"; the collection was in days not long past the "offering"; the pastor is the "minister," and in olden times the "Instrument," his house is the "manse," he is "licensed" to preach and becomes a "probationer" till he is "ordained" over a charge; a bad report about him is a "fama," which, on being proved, may lead to his "suspension" or "deposition"; presence at worship is "attendance upon ordinances"; the decisions of a synod or assembly are its "Acts"; a minister's income is his "stipend"; "purgation of scandal" is not obsolete—and there are many other familiar technical terms and phrases.

¹ For some renderings, the result 1686; and reprinted in Cotton's of deplorable ecclesiastical bias, reference may be made to Bishop Kidder's "Reflections on a French New Testament" printed at Bordeaux, 1863.

It may be mentioned that Parsons, already referred to on p. 148, wrote under the name of Doleman a "Conference," in which he maintained, with considerable ingenuity, the right of the Spanish Infanta to the English crown. A reply was made by the great Scottish jurist, Sir Thomas Craig, in 1602.

THE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

"If the Arian heresy was propagated and rooted by means of beautiful vernacular hymns, so who will say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on in the ear like a music that never can be forgotten, like the sound of church bells, which the convert hardly knows how long he can forego. Its felicities seem often to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of national seriousness. Nay, it is worshipped with a positive idolatry; in extenuation of whose grotesque fanaticism, its intrinsic beauty pleads availingly with the man of letters and the scholar. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments; and all that there has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him for ever out of his English Bible. It is his sacred thing, which doubt never dimmed, and controversy never soiled. It has been to him all along as the silent, but O how intelligible, voice of his guardian angel; and in the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant, with one spark of religiousness about him, whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible."

F. W. FABER.

*In Brown's Lectures on
Ward's Exposit of the
Protestant Bible
this passage is quoted
as from Dr. Newman.
(See p 33)*

CHAPTER XLIII.

QUEEN ELIZABETH, after a reign of more than forty-four years, died on the 24th of March, 1603; and on the 5th April, James VI of Scotland left Edinburgh, and proceeded to London, to take possession of the English crown as the great-grandson of Margaret Tudor, and he had the good fortune to quash the claims of several rivals without public disturbance.¹ Though he was now thirty-seven years of age, he made the journey with all the glee of a schoolboy released for a holiday, and scattered honours about him in indiscriminate profusion. Utterly devoid of those graces of form and manner which characterized his mother, wanting also the dignity and gallant bearing of his great kinswoman and predecessor, he yet received a frank and harmonious welcome from his new subjects.

Strange and romantic incidents had marked his infantine years. Born in the Castle of Edinburgh on the 19th of June,

¹ After the death of James IV at Flodden, his widow, Margaret Tudor, married the Earl of Angus, and by this union Lady Arabella Stewart, cousin of King James, was her great-grand-daughter. King Henry, in his will, put aside the Scottish line, the descendants of his elder sister Margaret, and gave preference to the line of Suffolk, the descendants of his younger sister Mary. James said, in his parting harangue to his northern people, that as he was righteous heir to the Scottish crown, so he was "righteous and more righteous" heir to the English crown—as if he had surmised that this last title was, or might be, called in question. The dedication prefixed to our present Bible throws in an assertion ever dear to its royal patron, when it speaks of "the government established in your Highness, and your hopeful seed, by an undoubted title."

1566, he was baptized in the chapel of Stirling Castle on the 15th December of the same year. His father, Darnley, though he was living at the time in the Fort,¹ was not present at the service which was held by torch light, but the Protestant Bothwell, so soon to be wedded to his mother after the Kirk-o'-Field tragedy of which he was a chief promoter, did the honours on the occasion. His baptismal font of gold weighing 330 ounces, and a present from Queen Elizabeth, was sent shortly after by his mother to the mint, to be turned into cash, in order to provide payment to "the bloody cut-throats" that formed her body-guard at the time of her marriage to that worthless and desperate ruffian by whom she was so bewitched as for his sake to renounce the Catholic faith, and renew the prohibition of the Mass, according to the enactment of 1560. She was wedded in her "dule weeds" as a widow, and the marriage was celebrated, not in the chapel, but in the council-chamber of Holyrood, none of the lords living in Edinburgh at the time deigning to be present at the fatal nuptials. Political events were rushing with tremendous rapidity; and Mary having, in her islet prison, signed her abdication on the 24th of July, 1567, her son was, four days afterwards, solemnly consecrated king at Stirling when he was thirteen months old, his head being put for a moment into the great Bruce's crown, and his hand made to touch the sword and sceptre, while through his sponsors, Lord Hume and the Earl of Morton,² he took the oath, "I, James, Prince and Steward of Scotland . . ." The mystic ceremonial being over, the Earl of Mar carried the anointed babe back to its nursery. Before he was two years old he was, by another representative—the Regent Murray—fighting against his mother; and her defeat at Langside by her son, through her half-brother, sent her a swift fugitive across the Border, to a long imprisonment and a terrible end.

The earliest memories of James were those of a boyish

¹ He was at the moment a doomed man, the "bond" being already signed for the destruction "of sic an young fool and proud tyran." ² John Knox preached on the occasion, though it is said that he objected to the anointing.

kinglet. On assuming the government, at the age of twelve, he presided in royal robes at a meeting of Council at Stirling, and spoke the words put into his mouth; but during the discussion he was specially exercised about a hole in the cloth which covered the table. His first visit in state to Edinburgh was typical of his subsequent career. On his arrival at the West Port, the pageant presented before him was the decision of the wise king, the actors being the two women with the child, and a servant with the sword. When he drew nigh to the "Great Kirk" "Dame Religion" asked him to enter; and, dismounting "at the lady's steps," he complied with the invitation. But when he came out, and moved down toward the cross, he was saluted by a "jolly Bacchus," who, seated on a barrel, drank again and again to his majesty's welcome, while puncheons were running wine for the mob.

James was indeed made up of contrasts, and his character presents a species of dualism. Nature had apparently intended him to be the greatest of his race in person and mind, but from the shock which his mother had received at the assassination of Rizzio, "he was a spoiled child, in a deplorably literal sense, before he was born," and the weakling was seven years old before he could stand upright, so that often in after life it was his wont to poise himself by leaning on the shoulders of others. His physical weakness was very visible, and when he engaged in the chase he had to be trussed into his saddle; but when "in the kirk," on Sunday, 3rd April, 1603, he delivered his last address to his Scottish subjects, and promised to visit them every three years, his boast was, "Ye mister not doubt, for I have a bodie als able as anie king in Europe." In early life he was an "old young man." The descendant of a long line of kings—Plantagenets, Tudors, and Stewarts—he was awkward in gait, and uncouth in person and manner, while "he ate and drank, dressed and played like a boor."¹ His tongue being too large for his mouth, his loquacity was a continuous sputter. While he "wallowed in filth, moral and physical,"² it was his joy to regard himself as the "Lord's

¹ Despatch of M. Fontenay—Froude, History, vol. XI, p. 664.

² Burton, History of Scotland, vol. VI, 161.

anointed." As he never washed his hands, the honour of kissing them must have exceeded the pleasure. Boasting of his tenacious hold of his sceptre, as if he had been a "mortal god" on earth, he was ever tossing it to unworthy favourites, as a bauble to play with—such favourites as Esmé Stewart in Scotland, and Buckingham in England, the latter of whom, in vulgar familiarity, used to name his sovereign "dear Dad and Gossip." His hatreds were as unaccountable as his likings which might vary, but his prejudices always tended to ripen into lasting antipathies. When he suspected that people imagined him to be facile, he sank into fits of sullenness and obstinacy, lest, to use his own words, he should be regarded as "led by the nose," or thought to be "ane irresolute ass." Though timid in temperament, he could be scared into momentary bravery. It has now been proved that the famous Gowrie conspiracy, in 1600, was a reality, but few of the king's contemporaries believed his account of it. His solitary adventure—the one romance of his life—was his voyage to Norway, to bring home his Danish bride. He had told his council that this matrimonial step was taken after asking the "Divine direction for fifteen days to move his heart the meetest way," and the General Assembly ordered a fast every Sabbath, and public prayers for his safety during his absence in Denmark. But while these loyal intercessions for him were going on in Edinburgh, he wrote to a friend a letter which begins, "From the Castle of Cronberg, where we are drinking and driving over in the auld manner." His shrewdness was barren and unpractical, and men of far less talent easily outwitted him. His possession of great good sense and humour, and his power of clothing a thought in a pithy and pregnant clause equal often to one of Bacon's, did not save him from being an oracular simpleton. He often meant well, but his best resolves died away in helpless and ludicrous indecision. Courtiers hoodwinked him by praising his subtlety. Coke, his surly attorney-general, was perfectly aware of the process by which the Gunpowder Plot had been detected, but, hungering for preferment, he ascribed the discovery to the king himself, and extolled him as "divinely illuminated by Almighty God, and like an angel of

God." He had the best head in his Council, but his sagacity rarely served him in ordinary business, and when he tried a Machiavellian policy, he was ever like a mole, blundering into light. He was cunning and indiscreet by turns, his gravity and levity being about as nearly balanced as were his hours of hunting and study. He raised Carr to the peerage, and sent Raleigh to the block. He wrote on theology and on tobacco. He acted like a child in matters of moment, but was awed into solemnity about trifles—as when he formally charged the head of the King's Bench with the crime of allowing his servant to ride bare-headed before him. Nor was he guileless; he corresponded with the pope on the one hand, and with the queen of England on the other, and thought that he was doing a clever piece of diplomacy in trying to ingratiate himself with two such masters. According to the English queen, who stigmatized him as "a double-tongued villain," he had been in the habit of calling Lord Morton "his father," up to the time when he contrived to have that nobleman seized, tried, and executed. He could not bear the sight of a drawn sword, and he was a sincere lover of peace, but his love of peace was sometimes allowed to degenerate into pusillanimity, as when he permitted his own son-in-law to be beaten out of his kingdom by the Imperial troops. In his desire to please, he occasionally allowed his subjects to fight under opposing standards. The assassination of Henry IV of France, the Armada, and the Gunpowder Plot, were fresh in the nation's memory, as events but of yesterday, and the king showed some desire to guard against such perils. But he subsided at length into a Catholic policy, as he longed for a Spanish alliance. His common talk was a continuous infringement of the Third Commandment, though he often expressed penitence for his lapses; and his Book of Sports was an attempt to induce a national violation of another Commandment, though it was curiously enacted in the royal wisdom, that none should share in the Sunday games but such as had attended church. He prided himself on his profound skill in kingcraft, which was too often but another name for insincerity and absolutism, and yet was hailed as the "wisest fool in Christendom." His belief in kingly supremacy was

only excelled by his belief in himself, and the immorality of his court was equalled by the imbecility of his government. Parliament had settled the amount of taxation on a certain import, but he had, of his own authority, and quite unconstitutionally, tripled the sum. When the case came to be heard in the Court of Exchequer, and when Chief Baron Fleming had decided in favour of the crown, James saluted him as "a judge to his heart's content." He held that as it was "blasphemy for divines to dispute what God might do," so it was sedition for subjects to discuss "what a king may do in the height of his power;" but his senseless notions of prerogative daily inculcated on his family, and so fully imbibed by them, brought in due time his son and successor to the scaffold before Whitehall. He strove hard to get royal proclamations identified in validity with statutes, as had been the case for a time in the reign of Henry VIII and by virtue of a proclamation he took the style and title of King of Great Britain. At the instigation of Bancroft, he claimed the right to sit in a court of law, and decide in person causes brought before him. Indeed, during his progress through England up to his new capital, he had sent a thief to the gallows without trial. He was so vain as to discuss legal questions with Lord Coke, "the incarnation of the common law of England," and so unjust as to dismiss the brave and unbending judge from his office of Chief Justice. When he chose St. James's day as the day of his coronation, he honoured his own name in that of the patron apostle; and a portion of the Ritual was altered, for to the words "laws which the king promised to observe" was added the clause, "agreeable to the king's prerogative." Tenacious of his own money, he was a lavish promiser of that of others, and his generous deeds were often sullied by subsequent acts of selfishness. It cost him nothing to visit Tycho Brahe and grant him a license of copyright in "his auld kingdom," or to give a prebendal stall to Isaac Casaubon; but he allowed old Archbishop Adamson, both a scholar and a poet, to languish and die in penury,—cowering on the one side of the fire and his cow stationed on the other—even though he had in his depression tried to stir

the royal sympathy by translating into Latin verse the Lamentations of Jeremiah. He also gave Casaubon an annual salary of £300, for which he was expected to fetch and carry in the king's polemical feuds. The patent conferring the salary, which is dated 19th January, 1611, speaks of the great scholar as coming to England, "to be used by us as we shall see cause, for the service of the Church." In the preparation of the reply to Cardinal Du Perron, the king supplied the argument, and Casaubon provided the Latin. James, however, has the credit of suggesting to Father Paul the compilation of his "History of the Council of Trent," and of urging Ussher to write his "Antiquities of the British Churches"; but he seems to have thought that such royal counsel was sufficient reward for literary labour.

Though his household was early noted for its profligacy, and though he himself was very far from being a pattern of sobriety or of sanctity of speech, James was a great frequenter of sermons; and though he was an "irreverent hearer,"¹ he had acquired a wonderful knowledge of Scripture and theology. His precocious acquaintance with the Bible was noted in his eighth year, and Killigrew,² the English Ambassador, heard him in the presence of his "preceptor," Buchanan, and his "master," Young, read off any chapter selected out of Latin into French, and out of French after into English, as well as few men could have added anything to his translation. James Melville records in his "Diary"³ that when he visited Stirling, in 1574, he saw the young king, and he describes him as "the sweetest sight in Europe that day, for strange and extraordinary gifts of ingyne, judgment, memorie, and language;" and he thus proceeds, "I heard him discours, walking up and doune in the auld Lady Mar's hand—of knowledge and ignorance, to my grait mervell and astonishment." He had a special ecstasy in theological disputations, and when, in his twenty-first year,

¹ In 1596 the General Assembly sent a deputation to him, to warn him not to talk during sermon, and

² Burton, History of Scotland, vol. V, p. 389.

³ P. 48, Woodrow Society edition. which he was blotted."

he held a solemn debate at Holyrood with the Jesuit Gordon, a cadet of the house of Huntly, he bore himself bravely through the controversy. Grotius sang the praises of his learned youth, and to him, in his fourteenth year, Beza dedicated his "Icones." He was under twenty when he produced his "Paraphrase upon the Revelation of St. John," and little more than twenty when he published "Ane Fruitful Meditatione," &c., on some verses of the twentieth chapter of the same Book—"By the maist Christian king and syncere professour, and chief defender of the faith, James the Sixth, King of Scottis." In 1584 he published "The Essayes of a Prentise in the divinc arte of Poesie." In his manhood, as in his earlier years, Biblical studies had an irresistible charm for him, and he composed commentaries and translated Psalms.¹ Quotations from Scripture in illustration of some argument, or to give point to some statement, were on all occasions flowing from his tongue; his common talk was characterized by allusions to the Bible, in season and out of season. He "wondrously coveted learned discussions," and during such discussions he delighted in pouring out his erudition in full flood. "As he had been deprived by the accident of birth of his true position as a theological professor, he lost no opportunity of turning his throne into a pulpit, and his sceptre into a controversial pen."² "Having," as he confessed, "a natural and salmon-like affection to see the place of his breeding," he came down to Edinburgh in 1617, and was inundated not only with Latin harangues, but when he went, on his fifty-first birthday, up to the Castle to visit the room he was born in, a boy was stationed at the gate to salute him with an address in Hebrew. He held disputations also at St. Andrews and Stirling, during which, and especially after which, he played the part of a pedant and buffoon. It was profound satisfaction to him, in the prime

¹ "His translation of the Psalter," as Bishop William intimates, "was stayed in the one-and-thirty Psalm," and his coadjutor was the Earl of Stirling.

² Motley, Life and Death of John of Barneveld, vol. I, p. 54, London, 1874.

of life, when he stirred up such antagonists as Bellarmine and Scioppius, and it was "bliss beyond compare" when a pamphlet of a hundred pages which he had written in a week, brought out from Cardinal Du Perron a reply of a thousand folio pages. He wrote at this time a "Monitory Epistle to all Christian Monarchs, free Princes, and States," and republished his *Triplici nodo triplex cuneus*, to which Bellarmine replied with no small craft and power. The question concerned Garnett, one of the conspirators who suffered for his connection with the Gunpowder Plot, and whom the Catholics were canonizing as a martyr to the inviolability of the secrets of the confessional. Bishop Andrewes replied to Fronto Ducaeus in his *Tortura Torti*, and Casaubon also composed an *Epistola* which brought upon him a *Responsio* from Andreas Eudæmon-Johannes¹ (L'Heureux), second in virulence and effrontery only to Scioppius himself. To these polemical efforts of the king flattering allusions are made in the Dedication prefixed to our Bibles:—"To go forward with the confidence and resolution of a man in maintaining the truth of Christ, and propagating it far and near, is that which hath so bound and firmly knit the hearts of all your majesty's loyal and religious people unto you, that your very name is precious among them: their eye doth behold you with comfort, and they bless you in their hearts, as that sanctified person who, under God, is the immediate author of their true happiness. And this their contentment doth not diminish or decay, but every day increaseth and taketh strength, when they observe that the zeal of your majesty toward the house of God doth not slack or go backward, but is more and more kindled, manifesting itself abroad in the farthest parts of Christendom, by writing in defence of the truth (which hath given such a blow unto that man of sin as will not be healed), and every day at home, by religious and learned discourse, by frequenting the house of God, by hearing the Word preached, by cherishing the teachers thereof, by caring for the Church, as a most tender and loving nursing father." But his love of orthodoxy was overborne by his worship of

¹ Life of Casaubon, by Mark Pattison, Rector of Lincoln College, p. 351, London, 1875.

prerogative, as when he ordered the Calvinistic work of Pareus on Romans to be burned by the hangman in Oxford and London, because a preacher had vindicated some notions on the liberty of the subject out of that erudite commentary. In the same spirit he opposed and wrote against Conrad Vorstius as an anti-St. John, and dictated to their High Mightinesses of Holland that, in the case of such a heretic, they should not "bear the sword in vain." He ordered his works to be burned, and he inscribed a treatise against him, thus: "To the honour of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the eternall Sonne of the eternall Father, to whom His most humble and most obliged servant, James, by the grace of God, king of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland, Defender of the faith, doth dedicate and consecrate this his Declaration." His interest in the controversies raging in the Low Countries was so intense and personal that, in 1618, he sent Hall, Davenant, and Balcanquhal as representatives to the Synod of Dort, and loaded them with numerous charges as to their duties and aims.¹ But tolerance of divergent opinion was distasteful to him, and when his voluble logic and learning failed to convert Bartholomew Legget from Arianism, he sent him to be burnt at Smithfield, 18th March, 1611. And a month later, Edward Wightman, for a combination of heresies, was burnt in the market place of Lichfield—dark spots of fire and blood staining the year that witnessed the happy publication of the version which the royal humour had originated and patronized. It was a work after his own heart when, in 1623, he tried to enjoin certain topics for treatment in sermons, and to proscribe others, as Predestination, Election, Reprobation, and the Universality, Efficacy, Resistibility and Irresistibility of God's grace. To this marvellous familiarity with Scripture,—a familiarity which grew with his growth, and became at length as distinctive of him as his

¹ Yet John Hales of Eton, "the ever memorable," who, as chaplain to Sir Dudley Carlton, ambassador at the Hague, attended the Synod of Dort, came back to England changed in his theology, being induced by what he heard and saw at the Dutch Assembly, to "bid John Calvin good night."

circular hobble¹ or his thickly quilted hose and doublet—are we largely, if not solely, indebted for our Authorized Version, which is dedicated "To the most high and mighty prince, James."

The people in England had been at some loss to conjecture what the ecclesiastical leanings of the expected sovereign might be. The Catholics hoped to get some relaxation of the penal laws from the son of her whom they idolized as a martyr. But he had written a hard, unfilial letter to his mother, refusing to accord her any present or prospective royal title, and his selfish love for his own interests had overpowered his anxieties about her life; for a few honeyed words and the present of some couples of English buckhounds, sealed his desertion of her cause, while she, in her turn, had cursed him, disinherited him, and bequeathed her kingdom to Philip of Spain. The Puritans had naturally some high anticipations, for in 1590 the king, "with bonnet off and hand lifted up to heaven," had said in Edinburgh to the General Assembly at its eighth session "that he thanked God for being born king in such a kirk, the sincerest kirk in the world—the kirk of Geneva keepe pasche and yuile; what have they for them? as for our neighbour kirk in England, it is an evil said mass in English, wanting nothing but the liftings. I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity and to exhort the people to do the same, and I forsooth, so long as I bruik my life, shall maintain the same." He had also written to Elizabeth in favour of some of the stout Puritans who suffered under her reign. No wonder that Archbishop Whitgift, knowing the vacillation of the king, and though he must have read the Basilicon Doron published in 1599—had some terror of what he called "a Scottish mist" settling down on Canterbury. For the king, after his great change of opinion on church government, was, as might be expected from his temperament, visited with occasional qualms—the clouds threatened to return after the

¹ "When the king came to the as his custom was. Mr. Robert chamber in Holyrood," where persons (Bruce) casteth himself to meet him." were waiting for him, "he walked Calderwood, History of the Church in a circle round about the house, of Scotland, vol. VI, p. 218.

rain. When he had read Calderwood's *Altare Damascenum*¹ he was observed to be somewhat pensive, and on one of his Episcopal courtiers telling him that they would answer it, he replied tartly—"What will you answer, man? There is nothing here but Scripture, reason, and the Fathers." There had also been previous fluctuations. Though the Convention of Leith, in 1572, had brought in the elements of Episcopacy, the National Covenant was subscribed by the king and his household in 1580, and the Second Book of Discipline, adopted in 1581, set out a full Presbyterian platform. But, by a reactionary process, Episcopacy was re-introduced—"bishops, abbots, and other prelates were authorized to sit and vote in Parliament"; and in 1610 the bishops got from the General Assembly meeting in Glasgow the right or power to ordain.² Such changes, in some of which the king was personally prominent as usual, could not but raise suspicious and anxious forecastings in England.

But the flatteries heaped upon James in England would have turned a stronger head. When at the Hampton Court Conference, he had said of the Puritans, "I will make them conform themselves, or I will harry them out of the land, or yet do worse," one lord exclaimed that his majesty "spoke by the instinct of the spirit of God." His Grace of Canterbury, swallowing the "sugared bait," ascribed the royal words "to the special assistance of God's spirit," and Bancroft, on his knees, gave thanks to God for "the singular mercy of such a king, as since Christ the like, he thought, had not been seen." When Selden was challenged by the king for applying such phrases as "unlimited liberty" and "confident daring" to his exposition of some parts of the Apocalypse, the accomplished critic and scholar could, in replying, bring himself to speak of the royal interpretation as "the clearest sun among the lesser lights, and to call it a performance most divine and kingly." One may contrast Bacon's adulation³

¹ Calderwood was banished by the king for his stout defence of Presbyterianism, and during his six years' exile in Holland he composed the book referred to—its name being based on the statement made in 2 Ki. xvi, 10.

² Works, vol. XII, p. 70, ed. Montague.

³ Grubb's Ecclesiastical History, vol. II, p. 293.

with the honest and pointed words of George Buchanan in his Dedication to his royal pupil of his "Baptistes." Yet there must have been no small amount of learning in the man who was so highly praised, not only by courtly churchmen like Bancroft, Williams, and Abbot, but by Bacon and Casaubon. The king's influence told even on Hugh Broughton, whose stiff knees were supplanted in the royal presence.

There had been handed to the monarch, on his way through the "promised land" to London, the millenary petition—a petition signed by seven hundred and fifty clergymen of the Church of England "groaning under a common burden of human rites and ceremonies." These points were rather subordinate in character, especially as compared with these great principles which contending parties had fought for in Scotland with sacred fury. James was now in no danger of being confronted by a "beardless boy," or of being roughly held by the sleeve, defied and scolded to his face as "God's silly vassal"; nor was there any chance of a sermon being preached before him inveighing against the power or person that would bring in the "bludie gullie" of despotism. He ran no risk of being detained by force in any baronial mansion as he had been in his sixteenth year at the Castle of Ruthven when, bursting into tears at the insult, he had been saluted with the gruff utterance of the Master of Glamis, "Better bairns greet than bearded men." The question was not as between prelacy and presbytery, or between organized societies struggling for supremacy as for life, but between members and office-bearers of the same established church. Therefore, neither a council nor an assembly was convened to consider the millenary petition, but simply a Conference. A royal proclamation was issued on the 24th of October, "touching a meeting for hearing and for the determining things pretended to be amiss in the church." The day originally fixed was the first of November, but as the plague was raging at the time, there was a postponement for a few weeks. Though Parliament had not met and James had not been crowned, the meeting was ultimately held in the Drawing-room of Hampton Court Palace on Saturday, Monday, and Wednesday, the 14th,

16th, and 18th, of January 1604.¹ There came, as summoned, to the conference nine bishops—Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury; Bancroft, Bishop of London; Matthew, of Durham; Bilson, of Winchester; Babington, of Worcester; Rudd, of St. David's; Watson, of Chichester; Robinson, of Carlisle; Dove, of Peterborough: Five deans—Montague, Dean of the Chapel Royal; Andrewes, of Westminster; Overall, of St. Paul's; Barlow of Chester; Bridges, of Salisbury; with King, Archdeacon of Nottingham; Field, afterwards Dean of Gloucester. There were also at the Conference some members of the Privy Council and five ecclesiastical lawyers, Sir Daniel Dunne, Sir Thomas Compton, Sir Richard Swale, Sir John Bennet, and Dr. Drury; Galloway, the king's Scottish chaplain (admitted by courtesy); Reynolds, President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford; Sparke, Prebendary of Lincoln; Chaderton and Knewstubs, two Fellows and Divines from Cambridge. The last four, who appeared in "Turkey gowns," represented the plaintiffs or Puritan clergy. Reynolds,² who had been Dean of Lincoln, was perhaps the most learned divine of the period. He was not chosen in any way by his own party, but he obeyed the royal summons. His friends thought that he had not risen to the occasion, but the king snubbed him unceremoniously, or, as Harrington reports, "used with him upbraidings rather than arguments, . . . bad the petitioners awaie with their snivellings, &c."³ Bancroft was as surly and rude to him as the king, who could, however, sometimes be playful. Reynolds had objected to the term "worship" in the Marriage Service, and the king merrily replied, "I'm thinking that if you had a gudewife yoursel, Doctor, you wouldna think any worship or reverence too much for her. Many a man speaks of Robin Hood who never shot in his bow." These persons were never all present on one day. The four "complaints" presented to the king referred to the church and its service, to its ministers and their living and maintenance,

¹ On October 21, 1603, there had been issued a royal proclamation forbidding all petitioning on religious questions.

² Sometimes, if not usually, given as Reinolds, occasionally as Raynolds or Rainolds.

³ *Nugæ Antiquæ*, vol. II, p. 228.

and to discipline. Heylin remarks, "The complainants, however, sped no better in relation to the forms of worship, than they had done in reference unto points of doctrine. And somewhat also was observed touching some errors in the old translation of the English Psalter, as also in the Gospels and Epistles, as they stood in the liturgy. But their objections were so stale, and so often answered, that the bishops and conformable party went away with an easy victory."¹ Thus the object for which the meeting was ostensibly summoned failed, and another great opportunity was lost for healing and harmonizing the divisions in the English Church. The Bishop of London lost his temper very early in the discussion, and did not recover it again.² Bancroft, Barlow, and the king were apparently quite unqualified in tact and temper to interfere in so delicate an adjustment. But at the meeting on Monday, when other matters had been disposed of, a new translation of the Bible was abruptly proposed. There had been some conversation on a portion of the Apocryphal Books, "which was answered by the Bishops of London and Winchester, but more pointedly by his majesty himself³ who, finding there had been great questioning amongst the lords at that place of Ecclesiasticus (xlvi, 10) with which, as if it had been their rest and upshot, they (who objected to it) began afresh; and seeing them so to urge it, and stand upon it, called for a Bible; first, showed the author of that book, who he was; then the cause why he wrote that book; next analysed the chapter itself; arguing and demonstrating that, whatsoever Ben Sirach had said there of Elias, Elias had, in his own person, while he lived, performed and accomplished: concluding, first, with a serious checke to Dr. Reinolds that it was not good to impose, upon a man that was dead, a sense never meant by him; secondly, with a pleasant apostrophe to the lords, 'What, trow ye, make these men so angry with Ecclesiasticus? By my

¹ *History of Presbyterianism*, p. 373. Cartwright might probably, had he survived, been a member of the conference.

² Blunt's *Plain Account*, p. 74.

³ Sum and substance of the conference . . . contracted by William Barlow, Doctor of Divinity and Dean of Chester, London, 1604, reprinted in 1625 and 1638.

soule, I think he was a bishop or else they would never use him so!' But for the generall, it was appointed by his majesty, that Dr. Reinolds should note those chapters in the Apocrypha Booke, where those offensive places were, and should bring them unto the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury against Wednesday next." There was a good deal of by-play on the part of the king, to whom silence was impossible in such a scene, and he had never had so grand an opportunity. He had a lively recollection of some Scottish scenes, and when the Puritans hinted at district meetings for conference, the king cried—"No; then Jack and Tom and Will and Dick shall meet and censure me and my government. . . . Stay, I pray you," he said to Dr. Reynolds, "for one seven years before you ask that of me, and if you find me pursy and fat, and my windpipe stuffed, I may listen to you. . . . Scottish Presbytery agreeth as well with a monarchy as God and the Devil."

According to Dr. Barlow's account,¹ Dr. Reinolds, after speaking upon several subjects, moved his majesty, "that there might be a new translation of the Bible because those which were allowed in the reigne of King Henry the eight and Edward the sixt were corrupt and not answerable to the truth of the originall. For example, first, Galat. iv, 25, the Greeke word *συντοίχαι* is not well translated as it now is, 'bordereth' neyther expressing the force of the word, nor the Apostle's sense, nor the situation of the place. Secondly, Psal. cv, 28, 'they were not obedient'; the original being, 'they were not disobedient.' Thirdly, Psal. cvi, 30, 'Then stood up Phineas and prayed': the Hebrew hath 'executed judgment.' To which motion there was at the present no gainsaying, the objections being triviall, and old, and already in print, often answered; only my lord of London well added, that if every man's humor should be followed, there would be no end of translating. Whereupon his highness wished that some especiall paines should be taken in that behalfe for one uniform translation; professing that he could never yet see a Bible well trans-

¹ Reprinted also from the Harwell, History of Conferences, p. 167, leian Miscellany in the Phoenix, vol. 3d ed., Oxford, 1849. I, p. 139, London, 1707, and by Card-

lated in English, but the worst of all his majesty thought the Geneva to be; and this to be done by the best learned in both the universities, after them to be reviewed by the bishops and the chief learned of the church; from them to be presented to the Privy Council; and lastly to be ratified by his royal authority; and so this whole church to be bound unto it and none other. Marry withal he gave this caveat, upon a word cast out by my lord of London, that no marginal notes should be added, having found in them which are annexed to the Geneva translation, which he saw in a Bible given him by an English lady, some notes very partial, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of dangerous and traitorous conceits, supporting his opinion by the section of the first chapter of Exodus and the nineteenth verse, where the marginal note alloweth disobedience unto the king;¹ and 2 Chronicles xv, 16, the note taxeth Asa for deposing his mother only; and not killing her."

The account given by the translators themselves in their own preface differs in some respect from that of Dr. Barlow: "The very historical truth is, that upon the importunate petitions of the Puritans at his majesty's coming to this crown, the conference at Hampton Court having been appointed for hearing their complaints, when by force of reason they were put from all other grounds they had recourse at the last to this shift, that they could not with good conscience subscribe to the communion-book, since it maintained the Bible as it was there translated, which was, as they said, a most corrupted translation. And although this was judged to be but a very poor and empty shift, yet even hereupon did his majesty begin to bethink himself of the good that might ensue by a new translation, and presently gave order for this translation which is now presented unto thee. This much to satisfy our scrupulous brethren." It is, however, chiefly to Dean Barlow's report that we owe our knowledge of what was said and done at the conference. Barlow wrote at the request of Whitgift, and refers in the preface to the "untimely death of him who first imposed it on me, with whom is buried the famousest glory of our English Church." As Reynolds com-

¹ But his own revisers, undeterred Heading to Exodus ii, "the godliness by the royal censure, prefix this of the midwives."

plained of the unfairness of Barlow's account, one is tempted to quote the characteristic remark of Fuller on this point—"when the Israelites go down to the Philistines to whet all their iron tools, no wonder if they set a sharp edge on their own and a blunt one on their enemies' weapons."¹ Barlow does not profess a full report, for his words to the reader are—"The vigour of every objection with the sum of each answer, I guess, I miss not." Reports had been sent abroad, he tells us, "some partial, some untrue, some slanderous." But it will not be found in Barlow that the king spoke strongly against the corruptions of the church for five hours together, though Galloway's account implies that the bishops were alarmed by his language, and Bishop Andrewes is reported to have said that "on that day his majesty did wonderfully play the Puritan,"² the shrewd prelate apparently taking it to be only a histrionic display. The king himself wrote a vainglorious account of the conference to somebody in Scotland whom he calls "honest Blake," telling how he "had kept such a revel with the Puritans and peppered them soundly," adding some rather indecent expressions. In this letter he alludes to another person whom he calls the "Beagle." He was fond of giving nicknames, and he begins an epistle to Lord Cranbourne with "my dear little Beagle."³

Now, from these narratives, it is evident that defects in the current versions were not among the things complained of, and they had no place in the millenary petition. Nor had there been any agitation on the subject; no body felt aggrieved, and there had been no consultation and arrangement among the Puritan members. The proposal seems to have been a momentary thought on the part of Reynolds who spoke only for himself, if Barlow's account is to be credited; and if his party afterwards acquiesced in the proposal, their consent may have been based on the renderings in the prayer-book version of the Psalms, for

¹ Church History, vol. III, p. 193, London, 1837.

² Calderwood, History, vol. VI, p. 421.

³ One brief account of some points "like to be brought up at the conference" may be seen in a letter of Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York, and there is "an Account" by Toby Matthew, Bishop of Durham—both printed in Cardwell's Conferences, p. 151, &c.

the discussion referred to it, and two of the instances adduced by Reynolds are from the psalter. The deliberations about a new revision, so suddenly introduced, seem to have occupied but a very brief period—a few minutes of the second day's conference—and as suddenly they closed. No one present dreamed that this light off-handed talk would produce the book which for more than two centuries and a half has been the cherished treasure of all the millions speaking the English tongue.

But there are also some assertions in these statements which cannot be accepted. The words put in the king's mouth in reference to the Genevan translation and notes "which he saw in a Bible given him by an English lady," are wholly incredible. The language implies that he had been till very recently a stranger to the Genevan version, and had only been brought into a brief and accidental acquaintance with it since his arrival in England. James was, indeed, one of those men who are consistent in inconsistency, and of whom very contradictory things may be believed; for the confidence with which he pronounced the Genevan version the worst which he had ever seen implies that he was really no stranger either to it or to other translations. Laud, on his trial, quotes this royal disparagement without any misgiving as to its accuracy. But if Barlow did not misunderstand the king on a point with which, as an English dignitary, he might not be very familiar, if James has not been in some way mis-reported, his virtual disclaimer of all knowledge up to a late period of the Genevan notes and version was simply a bold unblushing falsehood, a clumsy attempt to sever himself from his earlier Scottish beliefs and usages that he might win favour with his English churchmen. His affectation of ignorance could scarcely impose on some of his audience. For from his boyhood he had known no other Bible. It had been read to him often till he must have been very weary, and he had often been made to read it in terror of mispronouncing any words in it. It had been set before him as punctually as his daily meals, and it had been scourged into him by his stern pedagogues: the texts of all the sermons he had ever listened to were selected out of it, and the long discourses under which he had yawned and shut his eyes were

thickly garnished with quotations taken from it.¹ It had been printed in his own kingdom and dedicated to him in 1576-79, the dedication solemnly warning him "to remember diligently how the setting forth and authorizing of this book pertains to his charge." The divines, both Prelatic and Presbyterian, among whom he mingled and with whom he often contended, cited the Genevan version with great profusion. Nay, more, he had himself published some expositions of Scripture before he came up to England, and he uses without disguise the Genevan version, as in his Meditation on 2 Chron. xv, 25, and on Rev. xx, 25, 29. Even in the collected edition of his works, edited by the Bishop of Winchester in 1616, the text of these treatises has not been conformed to the Authorized Version, though the royal Scotch has been turned into English. Other pieces in the same volume—"Meditation on the Lord's Prayer"—"a Paterne for a king's inauguration" (1617), follow the present translation. Some of his prelates might have told him that the obnoxious note attached to Exodus i, 19,² of which he complained, was to be found in their own Bishops' Bible² in a briefer form—"it was better to obey God than man," and that the note to 2 Chron. xv, 16, occurs also in several editions of the same version. He might have been further informed that the note to Romans xiii, and especially to Titus iii, 1, in the disparaged translation might satisfy even a Stewart in its inculcation of obedience and loyalty, and in its investiture of the civil magistrate with the sword of persecution, for it declares that as his "office is to maintain God's glorie in His church, he ought to cut off all such rotten and infectuous members from the bodie." Besides, in the three passages put forward by Dr. Reynolds as arguments for a revision, the Genevan version is correct. Whatever might be the extent of the king's knowledge of the Genevan Bible, he had

¹ The person of the prince was at length deemed too sacred for the unsparing application of the birch, and a substitute was procured to bear the penalties—the writhing and howling of the "whipping boy" being meant to appal the heart of the royal pupil.

² There is no note in the editions of 1568, 1572, 1575, or 1578, but the Genevan note occurs in the editions of 1573, 1585, and 1602.

a genuine horror of some of its notes. In the account of the conference given by Galloway, his Scottish chaplain, to the Presbytery of Edinburgh—an account revised by the king himself—he says "Sundry, as they favoured, gave out copies of things here concluded, whereupon myself took occasion, as I was an ear and eye witness, to set them down, and presented them to his majesty, who with his own hand mended some things, and eked other things which I had omitted: which corrected copy with his own hand I have, and of it have sent you herein the just transumpt word by word." Then we find the following as the second of the articles, "On the heads which his majesty would have reformed at this time." ". . . That a translation be made of the whole Bible, as consonant as can be to the original Hebrew and Greek; and this to be set out and printed without any marginal notes, and only to be used in all churches of England in time of divine service. London, this 10th Februar, 1604."

Few of the clergy assembled had any reputation as Biblical scholars, and the majority of the bishops present at the meeting were not even employed as translators. Such a "comital conference" was neither qualified nor prepared to entertain and discuss the momentous question; but debate was needless, for the king assented to the proposal of Reynolds, and thus was originated the present version. The clergy had no desire for a new translation, or indeed for any changes. But the king had a morbid liking for such subjects, and he at once took up the project as far as his nature could earnestly occupy itself with a single pursuit. Biblical lore and theological subjects had, as we have said, a special interest for him, and it may be affirmed that his Biblical erudition, and his irrepressible desire to show it on all possible occasions, saved the proposal of Reynolds from falling into the same tomb as did all the other topics of conference. Bancroft spoke truly, when he afterwards said, "I am persuaded his royal mind rejoiceth more in the good hope which he hath for the happy success of that work, than of his peace concluded with Spain."

Some months had passed after the conference; Parliament and Convocation had met, and nothing more was said of the

new translation. But the project of a new translation had not been allowed to drop.

The king could have little personal knowledge of English scholars; but a careful selection of them was made by some unknown, but very competent authority. In the preface, Bancroft is virtually connected with the nomination, for it is said of him, "to whom not only we, but our whole church was much bound. He knew by his wisdom, that it is a preposterous order to teach first, and to learn after; yea, that to learn and practice together is neither commendable for the workman, nor safe for the work." Therefore, such were thought upon as could modestly say with St. Hierome, 'but we have learned the Hebrew tongue in part, and in the Latin we have been exercised almost from our very cradle.'" The names of the persons chosen were presented for the royal approbation, and by the 30th of June, Bancroft wrote to the translators at Cambridge, that it was the king's pleasure that they should with all possible speed meet together in their university, and begin the work. On the 22nd of July, the king wrote to Bancroft, then representing the See of Canterbury, vacant by the death of Whitgift, announcing that he had appointed certain learned men, to the number of four-and-fifty, for the translating of the Bible, and requiring him to take measures whereby he might be able to recompense the translators by church preferment. "Furthermore, we require you to move all our bishops to inform themselves of all such learned men within their several dioceses, as having special skill in the Hebrew and Greek tongues, have taken pains in their private studies of the Scriptures, for the clearing of any obscurities either in the Hebrew or in the Greek, or touching any difficulties or mistaking in the former English translation, which we have now commanded to be thoroughly viewed and amended; and thereupon, to write unto them, earnestly charging them, and signifying our pleasure therein, that they send such their observations either to Mr. Lively our Hebrew reader in Oxford, or to Dr. Andrewes, Dean of Westminster, to be imparted to the rest of their several companies; that so our said intended translation may have the help and furtherance

of all our principal learned men within this our kingdom." Bancroft wrote again to the Bishop of Norwich as follows: "There are many, as your lordship perceiveth, who are to be employed in this translation of the Bible, and sundry of them must of necessity have their charges borne; which his majesty was very ready, of his most princely disposition, to have borne, but some of my lords, as things now go, did hold it inconvenient. Whereupon it was left to me, to move all my brethren, the bishops, and likewise every several dean and chapter, to contribute to this work. According, therefore, to my duty, I heartily pray your lordship, not only to think yourself what is meet for you to give for this purpose, but likewise, to acquaint your dean and chapter, not only with the said clause in his majesty's letter, but likewise with the meaning of it, that they may agree on such a sum as they mean to contribute. I do not think that a thousand marks will finish the work to be employed as aforesaid. Whereof your lordship, with your dean and chapter, having due consideration, I must require you, in his majesty's name, according to his good pleasure, in that behalf, that as soon as possibly you can send me word what shall be expected from you, and your said dean and chapter. For I am to acquaint his majesty with every man's liberality towards this most godly work. From Fulham, this 31st of July, 1604." Bancroft makes another explanation, "After my hearty commendations unto your lordship, I have received letters from his most excellent majesty, the tenor whereof followeth. 'Right trusty and well beloved, we greet you well. Whereas we have appointed certain learned men, to the number of four-and-fifty, for the translating of the Bible, and that in this number divers of them have either no ecclesiastical preferment at all, or else so very small, as the same is far unmeet for men of their deserts, and yet, we of ourself in any convenient time cannot well remedy it: therefore we do hereby require you, that presently you write, in our name, as well to the Archbishop of York, as to the rest of the bishops of the province of Canterbury, signifying unto them that we do will, and straitly charge every one of them, as also the other bishops

of the province of York, as they tender our good favour towards them, that (all excuses set apart) when any prebend or parsonage being rated in our book of taxations, the prebend to twenty pounds at least, and the parsonage to the like sum and upwards, shall next upon any occasion happen to be void, and to be either of their patronage, or of the patronage and gift of any person what ever, they do make stay thereof, and admit none unto it, until certifying us of the avoidance of it, and of the name of the patron, if it be not of their own gift, that we may commend for the same some such of the learned men, as we shall think fit to be preferred unto it; not doubting of the bishops' readiness to satisfy us herein, or that any of the laity, when we shall in time move them to so good and religious an act, will be unwilling to give us the like due contentment and satisfaction; we ourselves having taken the same order for such prebends and benefices as shall be void in our gift.'" And he naively adds—"Your Lordship may see how careful his majesty is for the providing of livings for these learned men. I doubt not, therefore, but your Lordship will have a due regard of his majesty's request herein, as it is fit and meet; and that you will take such order, both with your Chancellor, Register, and such of your Lordship's officers who shall have intelligence of the premises, as also with the Dean and Chapter of your Cathedral Church, whom his majesty likewise requireth to be put in mind of his pleasure herein; not forgetting the latter part of his majesty's letter, touching the informing yourself of the fittest linguists, &c. I could wish your Lordship would, for my discharge, return me in some few lines the time of the receipt of these letters, that I may discharge that duty which his majesty, by these his letters, hath laid upon me. And so I bid your Lordship right heartily farewell. From Fulham this xxxi day of July, 1604—R. LONDON." The royal words about remuneration are very kind and considerate, still they were but words. The disbursements were not made from the royal purse—for it was empty, and Cecil had already complained that the monarch's household expenses were double those of his predecessors, £100,000 instead of £50,000. James had been always warring with poverty in

Scotland, and he at once leapt into extraordinary prodigality in England.¹ The proposed plan of ecclesiastical preferments cost nothing to his majesty, who sank so low as to sell ninety-three baronetcies for £1000 each, and to grant several peerages for a handsome price. Printers and publishers were aware of the royal impecuniosity, and were very cautious in dealing with the royal "bookmaker." Lydiat, in a letter of 22nd August, 1611, tells Ussher, that Norton swore to him that he would not print the king's Latin book against Vorstius, "unless he might have the money"—unless he had the payment before the treatise went to press. When a library was to be furnished for Prince Henry, Bancroft sent out a begging circular asking books or money from the bishops, and the "abler sort of double-beneficed men," and "the richer sort of commissaries," it being also dictated that some should give twenty marks, some £10, and the least twenty nobles. But the plan proposed for remunerating the translators, though it menaced the king's personal inspection of the contributors, did not succeed; neither bishop nor dean replied, so far as is known. The sum, according to Bancroft's calculation, was not large, only a thousand marks or about £700, so that the proportion from each diocese was really little.

Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, chancellor of the University of Cambridge, wrote also a sensible letter to the vice-chancellor and heads, asking that any poor scholar from the country be entertained "in any college they make choice of, free of charge for their entrance, their chambers, or their commons." But very few people had any great interest in the work. They were quite satisfied with the two current versions, as was also

¹ Soon after his accession to the throne of England, a proclamation was issued, forbidding his northern subjects to come as suitors for payment of "auld debts due to them by the king, . . . which is of all kinds of importunity most unpleasant to his majesty." In 1610, his debts were half a million, and his ordinary expenditure exceeded his income by £81,000 a year. He invented the order of baronet, and sold many baronetcies. Of the ninety lay peers in the House of Lords at his death, nearly a half were the result of pecuniary bargaining. He held firmly by the wardship of heirs and heiresses, and made money by this old feudal right.

amply shown in the slow reception of the one which was now in preparation. Indeed, the next Convocation, ignoring the purpose of a new Bible, or doubting if it would be carried out, ordered in its eighty-first article that every parish unfurnished with a Bible of the largest volume,¹ should at once provide the same. Still, according to the chancellor's suggestion, the translators assembled at the Universities had entertainment free of charge, "eating their commons"² at the college table,³ and at the final revision the six or twelve revisers received each, according to one statement, thirty shillings a week from the Company of Stationers, "though before they had nothing but the self-rewarding ingenious industry." King James's version never cost King James a farthing. Robert Barker had indeed, as royal printer, a salary from the king of £6, 13s. 4d.; but he had also, in consideration of £300 paid to the crown, a grant of the manor of Upton, near Windsor, for twenty-two years, for the small rent of £20, to be doubled two years afterward.³ The argument, therefore, is not based on fact, that the crown may grant the sole printing of the English translation, because it was made at the king's charge. Yet Lord Mansfield said, against all proof, "The English translation the king bought, therefore it has been concluded to be his property. His whole right rests on the foundation of property in the copy, by the common law."⁴

Some mystery yet hangs over the number of translators appointed, as the king mentions fifty-four, while only forty-seven took part in the work. In the interval there were some changes. Mr. Lively having died in 1605, his place was filled by Dr. Spalding; Dr. Richard Eades died in 1604;

¹ *Amplissimi voluminis.*

² John Bois or Boyes, whose notes of the proceedings have unfortunately fallen out of existence, at least out of view, "ate his commons" first at one college table, and then at another. — Walker's *Life of Bois*, Harleian MSS. Communications must have been sent to Oxford

similar to those sent to Cambridge, though they do not seem to have been preserved.

³ The salary of the Chief Justice of the King's Bench was then £224, 19s. 6d. a year.

⁴ Lee's *Memorial*, p. 216. Blackstone's *Commentaries*, vol. II, p. 410, London, 1809.

Dr. Aglionby, appointed in his room, died in February, 1610, and Mr. Dakins died in February, 1607. The proposer, Dr. Reynolds, died in May, 1607, and Dr. Thomas Ravis, bishop of London, died in 1609, and there may have been some resignations and substitutions. Dr. Leonard Hutton was appointed for Dr. Ravens, whose place had been vacated. The preparations seem to have been completed by the end of 1604; but the work was not formally taken in hand by all the companies till about 1607. The translators themselves intimate that their work occupied them "about two years and three quarters." They were divided into six companies, two of which met at Westminster, two at Oxford, and two at Cambridge.¹

"The following is an account of the places and persons agreed upon for the Hebrew Scriptures, with the particular books by them undertaken: Pentateuchon; the story from Joshua to the first book of Chronicles, exclusive, to the company at Westminster, consisting of Mr. Dean of Westminster, Mr. Dean of Paul's, Mr. Dr. Saravia, Mr. Dr. Clark, Mr. Dr. Leifield, Mr. Dr. Teigh, Mr. Burleigh, Mr. King, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Beadwell. From the first of the Chronicles with the rest of the story and the Hagiography; videlicet, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, to the company at Cambridge, consisting of Mr. Lively, Mr. Richardson, Mr. Chatterton, Mr. Dillingham, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Andrewes, Mr. Spalding, Mr. Binge. The four or greater prophets, with the Lamentations, and the twelve lesser prophets, to the company at Oxford, consisting of Dr. Harding, Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Holland, Dr. Kilbye, Mr. Smith, Mr. Brett, Mr. Fairclough. The prayer of Manasse, and the rest of the Apocrypha, to the company at Cambridge, consisting of Dr. Duport, Dr. Branthwait, Dr. Radcliffe, Mr. Ward, Mr. Downes, Mr. Boyes, Mr. Ward.

"The places and persons agreed upon for the Greek, with the particular books by them undertaken:—The four Gospels, Acts of Apostles, Apocalypse, to the company at Oxford, consisting of Mr. Dean of Christ Church, Mr. Dean of Winchester, Mr. Dean of Worcester, Mr. Dean of Windsor, Mr. Savile, Dr. Perne, Dr. Ravens, Mr. Harmer. The epistles of St. Paul, to

¹ Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, vol. II, p. 106.

the company at Westminster, consisting of Dean of Chester, Dr. Hutchison, Dr. Spencer, Mr. Fenton, Mr. Rabbett, Mr. Sanderson, Mr. Dakins."¹

Many of the men employed in this noble enterprise were famous for their ability and learning. Andrewes, "a right Godly man," was "a prodigious student," "a great gulph of learning," and might have been "interpreter general at Babel." "The world wanted learning to know how learned this man was."² His *Manual of Private Direction* was composed in Greek. He sent Beadwell to Leyden, to study Arabic, and promised to defray the expense of printing his *Thesaurus Arabicus*. Casaubon writes to Heinsius, "I am attracted to the man by his profound learning," "one of a few whose society enables me to bear my separation from De Thou." Andrewes was in great favour with the king at this time, on account of his "Tortura Torti"—his clever and telling reply to Bellarmine, published in 1609, when he was bishop of Chichester. Overall is styled by Camden, "a prodigious learned man," possessed, as Fuller says, "of a strong brain to improve his great reading," "a man learned all round," and Casaubon who had enjoyed his hospitality, styles him *vir longe doctissimus*.³ Hadrian Saravia, prebendary of Canterbury, born at Hedin in Artois, his father being a Spaniard, and his mother a Belgian, was a D.D. of Leyden, and was educated, according to Wood, in all kinds of literature, especially "in several languages," and was noted for his Hebrew learning. Tighe or Teigh was an "excellent textuary and profound linguist." King succeeded Spalding as Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge. Thompson, born in Holland, of English parents, and, by report, a most admirable philologer, though desultory in his studies, belonged to Clare Hall, Cambridge. "Dutch Thompson," as he was familiarly called at Cambridge, supplied suggestions to his friend Casaubon for an edition of Suetonius and Polybius,⁴ and was a familiar correspondent of Scaliger

¹ The list was taken by Cardwell from Burnet's *History*, vol. II, 330. Append., p. 366, who copied it from the papers of Bishop Ravis.

² Pattison's *Life of Casaubon*, p.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 391.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 333.

and other scholars, who set a high value on his critical suggestions. Beadwell, or Bedwell, was the great Arabic scholar of his time, the friend of Erpenius and tutor of Pococke. His MSS. of a prepared Arabic Lexicon were used in the preparation of Castell's *Lexicon Heptaglotton*. Edward Lively was "one of the best linguists in the world," and, according to Dr. Pusey, was, next to Pococke, "the greatest of Hebraists." Richardson, Professor of Divinity, was "a most excellent linguist." Chaderton, or Chatterton, "grave, godly, learned, familiar with the Greek and Hebrew tongues, and the numerous writings of the Rabbis," was one of the four Puritan divines that took part in the Hampton Court Conference. He was the first head of Emmanuel College, and lived to a very great age. Dillingham was called "the great Grecian." Harrison had "exquisite skill in Hebrew and Greek idioms," and was one of the chief examiners in the University. Spalding was reckoned worthy to succeed Lively as Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, and Byng was a successor of Spalding in the Hebrew chair. Harding was Regius Professor of Hebrew. Reynolds was president of Corpus Christi College, and in Bishop Hall's words, "his memory and reading were near to a miracle, for he was himself a well furnished library, full of all faculties, all studies, and all learning," and though, according to Wood, he was the pillar of Puritanism, yet he calls him "the very treasury of erudition, as being most prodigiously seen in all kinds of learning, most excellent in all tongues." Holland, King's Professor of Divinity, and Rector of his College, is declared to be "a most learned divine." Kilbye, who preached his funeral sermon, said of him that he had "a wonderful knowledge of all the learned languages," and was mighty in the Scriptures, while, according to Wood, he was "another Apollos, a most learned divine." Kilbye himself was Professor of Hebrew, and Rector of his College, and left a commentary on Exodus, chiefly drawn from rabbinical sources. He also continued, though he did not publish, Jean Mercier's commentaries on Genesis. He was ever absorbed in Hebrew study, and Casaubon saw at his lodging the *Lexicon Arabicum* of Raphelengius, the only other copy in the country being that in possession of the Bishop of

Ely. Izaak Walton, in his life of Sanderson, tells the following story of Kilbye: "I must here stop my reader, and tell him that this Dr. Kilby was a man of so great learning and wisdom, and so excellent a critic in the Hebrew tongue, that he was made professor of it in this University; and was also so perfect a Grecian, that he was by King James appointed to be one of the translators of the Bible; and that this doctor and Mr. Sanderson had frequent discourses, and loved as father and son. The doctor was to ride a journey into Derbyshire, and took Mr. Sanderson to bear him company; and they, resting on a Sunday with the doctor's friend, and going together to that parish church where they then were, found the young preacher to have no more discretion, than to waste a great part of the hour allotted for his sermon in exceptions against the late translation of several words (not expecting such a hearer as Dr. Kilby), and showed three reasons why a particular word should have been otherwise translated. When evening prayer was ended, the preacher was invited to the doctor's friend's house, where, after some other conference, the doctor told him, he might have preached more useful doctrine, and not have filled his auditors' ears with needless exceptions against the late translation; and for that word for which he offered to that poor congregation three reasons why it ought to have been translated as he said, he and others had considered all of them, and found thirteen more considerable reasons why it was translated as now printed; and told him, 'If his friend' (then attending him) 'should prove guilty of such indiscretion, he should forfeit his favor.' To which Mr. Sanderson said, 'He hoped he should not.' And the preacher was so ingenuous as to say, he would not justify himself. And so I return to Oxford." Miles Smith, one of the translators, then one of the supervisors, final examiner and editor along with Bilson, and author of the preface, was an uncommon scholar, and "had Hebrew at his finger ends," and was "well versed in patristic writings and rabbinical glosses." Richard Brett was "skilled and versed to a criticism in the Latin, Greek, Chaldee, Arabic, and Ethiopic tongues." Thomas Ravis, the president of his company had a high reputation, for he was Dean of Christ

Church, and vice-chancellor of the University. George Abbot is described by Wood as "a learned man, having his learning all of the old stamp." Abbot enjoyed at this time the full lustre of the royal countenance, for he had written a defence of the truth of the Gowrie conspiracy. George Sprott, a notary at Eyemouth, had been executed for his connection with it; and Abbot, who had been present at the trial and execution, published an account of them, with the notes of Sir William Hart, the presiding judge. In concert with the Earl of Dunbar, he had gratified the heart's desire of the king, by helping to set up the luckless Stewart Episcopacy in Scotland, so that when Canterbury became vacant, he was promoted over the head of Andrewes and made Archbishop. Giles Tomson "took a great deal of pains of translating." John Aglionby, appointed in room of Richard Eades, was "accomplished in learning, and an exact linguist." John Harmer was a "most noted Latinist, Grecian, and divine." William Barlow, a member of the Hampton Court Conference, and its historian, is said to have been "a thorough bred scholar." John Spencer, the intimate friend of Hooker, succeeded Reynolds as president of Corpus Christi College. Roger Fenton's eulogist, Bishop Felton, says of him, "Never a more learned man hath Pembroke Hall, with but one exception," probably Bishop Andrewes. William Dakins was Greek lecturer at Cambridge, and "had great skill in the original languages." Of the company to which was intrusted the Apocrypha, John Duport was four times elected vice-chancellor of his University, and left a "well earned reputation." William Branthwait was master of Gonville and Caius College. Jeremiah Redcliffe was made a doctor of divinity, both at Cambridge and Oxford. Samuel Ward, Master of Sidney Sussex College, and Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, was "skilled in tongues, though slow of speech," and was a valued correspondent of Archbishop Ussher, on points of Oriental and Biblical criticism. Andrew Downes, one of the revising committee, Professor of Greek at Cambridge, is highly praised by Selden, and is described as "one composed of Greek and industry." Casaubon and he cor-

responded in Greek, and his letters in point of style are not inferior to those of the great foreign scholar.¹ John Bois, prebendary of Ely, was a favourite pupil of Professor Downes, and "a precocious Greek and Hebrew scholar." After the Apocrypha was finished, he joined, at their own earnest request, the Cambridge company, which had their assigned section from Chronicles to Canticles, and he was one of the delegates engaged in the final supervision; Sir Henry Savile calls him "most ingenious and most learned," and, according to another eulogist, he was "second to none in solid attainments in the Greek tongue." Thomas Bilson, who, along with Miles Smith, had final charge of the translation, and prepared the summary of contents at the head of each chapter, was Bishop of Winchester, and was "well skilled in languages." Henry Savile was Warden of Merton College, Oxford, Provost of Eton, and editor of the works of Chrysostom. Of Michael Rabbet little is known, save that he was Rector of St. Vedast, Foster Lane, London. Burleigh, Clarke, Leifield, Sanderson, Tighe, King, Roger Andrewes are in similar obscurity.² The list of revisers was a good one, but men like Gataker and Selden had no place in it.

The king had intimated, at the outset, that his revisers might be compensated by ecclesiastical preferments, and during the work, or soon after 1611, the following preferments were made: Andrewes, Dean of Westminster, became Bishop of Chichester in 1605, of Ely 1609, and of Winchester in 1619; Overall, Dean of St. Paul's, became Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry in 1614, and of Norwich in 1618; Saravia, Canon of Westminster, became Prebendary of Gloucester and Canterbury; Roger Andrewes, Fellow of Pembroke Hall, became Prebendary of Chichester; Byng, Fellow of St. Peter's College, became in 1606 Sub-Dean of York, and in 1618 Archdeacon of Norwich; Miles Smith, Canon of Hereford, became Bishop of Gloucester in 1612; Ravis, Dean of Christ Church, was in 1605

¹ The letters of Downes are preserved in the British Museum, 1709.

Burney MSS. 364, and five of Casaubon's are in his *Epistolae*, ing.

² The names vary much in spelling.

presented to the Bishoprick of Gloucester, and in 1607 to that of London; Abbot, Dean of Winchester, became Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry in 1609, and of London in 1610, and was preferred to the Chair of Canterbury in 1611; Giles Tomson became in 1611 Bishop of Gloucester, but died the next year; Barlow,¹ Dean of Chester, became Bishop of Rochester in 1605, and of Lincoln in 1608; Spencer received a prebendal stall in St. Paul's, London, in 1612; Fenton, Minister of St. Stephen's Walbrook received the prebend of Pancras in St. Paul's; Duport became, in 1609, Prebendary of Ely; Samuel Ward received several preferments; John Bois became Prebendary of Ely, in 1615; Henry Savile was knighted.

The following were the directions given for the revision:—1. "The ordinary Bible read in the church, commonly called the Bishops' Bible, to be followed and as little altered as the truth of the original will permit." 2. "The names of the prophets and the holy writers, with the other names of the text, to be retained as nigh as may be—accordingly as they were vulgarly used." 3. "The old ecclesiastical words to be kept—viz., the word church not to be translated congregation,² &c." 4. "When a word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most of the ancient fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of the faith." 5. "The division of the chapters to be altered either not at all or as little as may be if necessity so require." 6. "No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words which cannot without some circumlocution so briefly and fitly be expressed in the text." 7. "Such quotations of places to be marginally set down as shall serve for the fit reference of one scripture to another." 8. "Every particular man of each company to take the same chapter or chapters, and having translated or amended them severally by himself where he thinketh good, all to meet together, confer what they have done, and agree for their parts what shall stand." 9. "As any one company hath dispatched

¹ According to Le Neve's *Fasti*, Barlow became Dean of Chester in June, 1602.

² This rule is referred to in their Preface.

any one book in this manner, they shall send it to the rest to be considered of seriously and judiciously; for his majesty is very careful in this point." 10. "If any company, upon the review of the book so sent, doubt or differ upon any place, to send them word thereof, note the place, and withal send the reasons; to which if they consent not, the difference to be compounded at the general meeting, which is to be of the chief persons of each company at the end of the work." 11. "When any place of special obscurity is doubted of, letters to be directed by authority to send to any learned man in the land for his judgment of such a place." 12. "Letters to be sent from every bishop to the rest of his clergy, admonishing them of this translation in hand, and to move and charge as many as being skilful in the tongues, and having taken pains in that kind, to send his particular observations to the company either at Westminster, Cambridge, or Oxford." 13. "The directors in each company to be the Deans of Westminster and Chester for that place and the king's professors in the Hebrew or Greek in either University." 14. "These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible: Tindale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Whitechurch's, Geneva."

The following was a kind of byelaw: "Besides the said directors before mentioned, three or four of the most ancient and grave divines in either of the Universities, not employed in translating, to be assigned by the Vice-Chancellor, upon conference with the rest of the heads, to be overseers of the translations as well Hebrew as Greek, for the better observation of the fourth rule above specified." This last precept seems to have originated in some doubts which had apparently risen at Cambridge about the meaning or application of the third and fourth rules, when an appeal was made to Bancroft, who replied to the Vice-Chancellor in these terms: "To be suer, if he had not signified so much unto them already, it was his Majestie's pleasure, that, besides the learned persons employed with them for the Hebrew and Greeke, there should be three or four of the most eminent and grave divines of their university, assigned by the Vice-Chancellour

upon conference with the rest of the heads, to be overseers of the translations, as well Hebrew as Greek, for the better observation of the rules appointed by his Highness, and especially concerning the *third* and *fourth* rule: and that when they had agreed upon the persons for this purpose, he prayed them to send him word thereof."¹

These scholars are usually called Translators, and they appropriate the name to themselves in their Dedication to King James. But it is to be borne in mind that the first rule set before them shows that in the stricter sense they were simply revisers of the Bishops' Bible, itself a revision of the Great Bible, and it again a revision of Matthew's Bible—that is, of Tyndale and Coverdale. In one of the letters already quoted, the king briefly alludes to the work as concerned with "the former English translation, which we have now commanded to be thoroughly viewed and amended." Their work is also described by themselves "as a translation so long in hand, or rather perusal of translations made before." Wee might justly feare hard censure, if generally we should make verball and unnecessary changings—that is, specially upon the Bishops' version. ". . . But it is high time to shew in briefe what wee proposed to our selues, and what course we held in this perusall and suruay of the Bible. Truly (good Christian reader) we never thought from the beginning, that we should neede to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one . . . but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principall good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath bene our endeavour, that our marke." And Gell's words are,² "Yet is not all the blame to be laid upon the translators, but part of it is to be shared with them also who set them at work, who by reasons of state limited them (as some of them have much complained) lest they might be thought, not to set forth a new

¹ In the "Brief Account" prefixed died in 1609, and Burnet was not to Bagster's Hexapla it is said that born till 1643.

Burnet received the rules from Dr. ² Essay toward the amendment of Ravis, one of the translators. This the late English translation of the could scarcely be, for Bishop Ravis Bible; Preface, p. 29. London, 1659.

translation, but rather a new Bible." Nay more, in justifying the value and necessity of their labours, they vindicate at the same time the principle of revision. "Many men's mouths have bene open a good while (and yet are not stopped), . . . and aske what may be the reason, what the necessitie of the employment. Hath the church bene de-ceiued, say they, all this while? Hath her sweet bread bene mingled with leauen, her silver with drosse, her wine with water, her milke with lime? Was their translation good before? Why do they now mend it? Was it not good? Why then was it obtruded to the people? Wee are so farre off from condemning any of their labours that traueiled before us in this kinde, either in this land or beyond sea, either in King Henrie's time, or King Edward's (if there were any translation or correction of a translation in his time), or Queen Elizabeth's of ever-renowned memorie, that we acknowledge them to haue beene raised vp of God, for the building and furnishing of His church, and that they deserue to be had of vs and of posteritie in euerlasting remembrance. Therefore blessed be they, and most honoured be their name, that breake the yce, and giue the onset vpon that which helpeth forward the sauing of soules. Now, what can bee more auaileable thereto, then to deliuer Gods book vnto Gods people in a tongue which they vnderstand?"

And they apologize for their own careful revision and re-revision: "Nothing is begun and perfited at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser: so, if we building vpon their foundation that went before vs, and being holpen by their labours, doe endauour to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike vs; they, we perswade our selues, if they were aliue, would thanke vs. . . . For by this meanes it commeth to passe, that whatsoever is sound alreadie (and all is sound for substance, in one or other of our editions, and the worst of ours farre better then their authentike vulgar) the same will shine as gold more brightly, being rubbed and polished; also, if any thing be halting, or superfluous, or not so agreeable to the originall, the same may bee corrected, and the trueth set in place. . . . Yet before we end, we must answer a third cauill and obiection

of theirs against vs, for altering and amending our Translations so oft; whereein truely they deale hardly, and strangely with vs. For to whom euer it was imputed for a fault (by such as were wise) to goe ouer that which hee had done, and to amend it wher hee saw cause? Saint *Augustine* was not afraide to exhort S. *Hierome* to a *Palinodia* or recantation; the same S. *Augustine* was not ashamed to retractate, we might say reuoke, many things that had passed him, and doth euen glory that he seeth his infirmities. If we will be sonnes of the Trueth, we must consider what it speaketh, and trample vpon our owne credit, yea and vpon other mens too, if either be any way an hinderance to it. This to the cause: then to the persons we say, that of all men they ought to bee most silent in this case.¹ For what varieties haue they, and what alterations haue they made, not onely of their Seruice bookes, Portesses and Breuiaries, but also of their *Latine* Translation? The Seruice book supposed to be made by S. *Ambrose* (*Officium Ambrosianum*) was a great while in speciall vse and request: but Pope *Hadrian* calling a Councill with the ayde of *Charles* the Emperour, abolished it, yea, burnt it, and commanded the Seruice-booke of Saint *Gregorie* vniuersally to be used. Well *Officium Gregorianum* gets by this menes to be in credit, but doeth continue without change or altering? No, the very *Romane* Seruice was of two fashions, the New fashion, and the Old (the one vsed in one Church, the other in another), as is to bee seene in *Pamelius*, a Romanist, his Preface, before *Micrologus*. The same *Pamelius* reporteth out of *Radulphus de Riwo*, that about the yeere of our Lord, 1277, Pope *Nicolas* the third remoued out of the Churches of *Rome*, the more ancient bookes (of Seruice) and brought into vse the Missals of the Friars Minorites, and commaunded them to bee obserued there; insomuch that about an hundred yeeeres after, when the aboue named *Radulphus* happened to be at *Rome*, he found all the bookes to be new (of the new stampe). Neither was there this chopping and changing in the more ancient times onely, but also of late: *Pius Quintus* himselfe confesseth, that euery Bishopricke almost had a peculiar kind

¹ The Catholics are referred to.

of seruice, most vnlike to that which others had : which moued him to abolish all other Breuiaries, though neuer so ancient, and priuiledged and published by Bishops in their Diocesses, and to establish and ratifie that onely which was of his owne setting foorth, in the yeere 1568. Now, when the father of their Church, who gladly would heale the soare of the daughter of his people softly and sleightly, and make the best of it, findeth so great fault with them for their oddes and iarring ; we hope the children haue no great cause to vaunt of their vniformitie. But the difference that appeareth betweene our Translations, and our often correcting of them, is the thing that wee are specially charged with ; let us see therefore whether they themselues bee without fault this way (if it be to be counted a fault to correct), and whether they bee fit men to throw stones at us." "Neither did we run ouer the worke with that posting haste that the *Septuagint* did, if that be true which is reported of them, that they finished it in 72 dayes ; the worke hath not bene hudled vp in 72 dayes, but hath cost the workemen, as light as it seemeth, the paines of twise seuen times seuentie two dayes and more : matters of such weight and consequence are to bee speeded with maturitie : for in a businesse of moment a man feareth not the blame of conuenient slacknesse." Those words, somewhat rhetorically used, are perhaps not to be taken with numerical exactness, at least John Bois is said to have "spent four years in this service."

They thus set a high value on translations of Scripture, and could not forget that Tyndale, Rogers, and Cranmer had been martyrs. Not only did they hold the earlier translators in grateful veneration, but they reckoned a translation of the Bible to be a work of necessity, and of lasting spiritual benefit. In utter contrast to the cold and niggardly views of the Rhemish versionists, who grudged, hesitated, and trembled to give an English Bible to their own people, they exult in the open unsealing and free dispersion of the inspired records :—

"But how shall men meditate in that which they cannot vnderstand ? How shall they vnderstand that which is kept close in an vnknown tongue ? as it is written, *Except I know the power of the voyce, I shall be to him that speaketh, a Bar-*

barian, and he that speaketh, shalbe a Barbarian to me. The Apostle excepteth no tongue ; not Hebrew the ancientest, not Greeke the most copious, not Latine the finest. Nature taught a naturall man to confesse, that all of vs in those tongues which wee doe not vnderstand, are plainly deafe ; wee may turne the deafe eare vnto them. The *Scythian* counted the *Athenian*, whom he did not vnderstand, barbarous : so the *Romane* did the *Syrian*, and the *Iew*, (euen S. *Hierome* himself calleth the Hebrew tongue barbarous, belike because it was strange to so many) so the Emperour of *Constantinople* calleth the *Latine* tongue, barbarous, though Pope *Nicolas* do storme at it : so the *Iewes*, long before *Christ*, called all other nations, *Logmazim*, which is little better than barbarous. Therefore, as one complaineth, that alwayes in the Senate of *Rome*, there was one or other that called for an interpreter : so lest the Church be driuen to the like exigent, it is necessary to haue translations in a readinesse. Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light ; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel ; that putteth aside the curtaine, that we may look into the most Holy place ; that remoueth the couer of the well, by which meanes the flockes of *Laban* were watered. Indeede without translation into the vulgar tongue, the vnlearned are but like children at *Iacobs* well (which was deepe) without a bucket, or some thing to draw with : or as that person mentioned by *Esay*, to whom when a sealed booke was deliuered, with this motion, *Reade this, I pray thee*, hee was faine to make this answeare, *I cannot, for it is sealed.*

"While God would be knowne onely in *Jacob*, and haue his Name great in *Israel*, and in none other place, while the dew lay on *Gideons* fleece onely, and all the earth besides was drie ; then for one and the same people, which spake all of them the language of *Canaan*, that is, *Hebrew*, one and the same originall in *Hebrew* was sufficient. But when the fulnesse of time draw neere, that the Sunne of righteousness, the Sonne of God should come into the world, whom God ordeined to be a reconciliation through faith in his blood, not of the *Iew* onely, but also of the *Greeke*, yea, of all them that were scat-

tered abroad; then loe, it pleased the Lord to stirre vp the spirit of a Greeke Prince (*Greeke* for descent and language), euen of *Ptoleme Philadelph*, King of Egypt, to procure the translating of the Booke of God out of *Hebrew* into *Greeke*. This is the translation of the *Seuentie* Interpreters, commonly so called, which prepared the way for our Sauour among the Gentiles by written preaching, as Saint *Iohn Baptist* did among the *Iewes* by vocall. For the *Grecians* being desirous of learning, were not wont to suffer bookes of worth to lye moulding in Kings Libraries, but had many of their seruants, ready scribes, to copie them out, and so they were dispersed and made common. Againe, the *Greeke* tongue was well knownen, and made familiar to most inhabitants in *Asia*, by reason of the conquest that there the *Grecians* had made, as also by the Colonies, which thither they had sent. For the same causes also it was well vnderstood in many places of *Europe*, yea, and of *Affrike* too. Therefore the word of God being set foorth in *Greek*, becommeth hereby like a candle set vpon a candlesticke, which giueth light to all that are in the house, or like a proclamation sounded foorth in the market place, which most men presently take knowledge of; and therefore that language was fittest to containe the Scriptures, both for the first Preachers of the Gospel to appeale vnto for wnesse, and for the learners also of those times to make search and triall by. It is certaine, that that Translation was not so sound and so perfect, but that it needed in many places correction; and who had bene so sufficient for this worke as the Apostles or Apostolike men? Yet it seemed good to the holy Ghost and to them, to take that which they found (the same being for the greatest part true and sufficient) rather than by making a new, in that new world and greene age of the Church, to expose themselues to many exceptions and cavillations, as though they made a translation to serue their owne turne, and therefore bearing wnesse to themselues, their wnesse not to be regarded."

"There were also within a few hundreth yeeres after CHRIST, translations many into the Latine tongue: for this tongue also was very fit to conuey the Law and the Gospel by, because in

those times very many Countreys of the West, yea of the South, East and North, spake or vnderstood Latine, being made Prouinces to the *Romanes*. But now the Latine Translations were too many to be all good, for they were infinite (*Latini Interpretes nullo modo numerari possunt*, saith *S. Augustine*). Againe, they were not out of the *Hebrew* fountaine (wee speake of the *Latine* Translations of the Old Testament) but out of the *Greeke* streame, therefore the *Greeke* being not altogether cleare, the *Latine* deriued from it must needs be muddie. This moued *S. Hierome*, a most learned father, and the best linguist, without controuersie, of his age, or of any that went before him, to vndertake the translating of the Old Testament, out of the very fountaines themselues; which hee performed with that euidence of great learning, iudgement, industrie and faithfulness, that he hath for euer bound the Church vnto him, in a debt of speciall remembrance and thankfulnesses."

These learned and good men knew the superlative value of the book on which they had been so long working, and they felt that their earnest labour was hallowed—that the altar sanctified the gift. They quote several of the Fathers in commendation of the pious and prayerful study of Scripture, and proceed to eulogize it in these significant and old-fashioned terms:—

"The Scriptures then being acknowledged to bee so full and so perfect, how can wee excuse our selues of negligence, if wee doe not studie them, of curiositie, if we be not content with them? Men talke much of *επειρώνη*, how many sweete and goodly things it had hanging on it; of the Philosophers stone, that it turneth copper into gold; of *Cornu-copia*, that it had all things necessary for foode in it; of *Panaces* the herbe, that it was good for all diseases; of *Catholicon* the drugge, that it is in stead of all purges; of *Vulcans* armour, that it was an armour of prooffe against all thrusts, and all blowes, &c. Well, that which they falsly or vainely attributed to these things for bodily good, wee may iustly and with full measure ascribe vnto the Scripture, for spirituall. It is not onely an armour, but also a whole armorie of weapons, both offensive and defen-

sue; whereby we may saue our selues and put the enemie to flight. It is not an herbe, but a tree, or rather a whole paradise of trees of life, which bring forth fruit euery moneth, and the fruit thereof is for meate, and the leaues for medicine. It is not a pot of *Manna*, or a cruse of oyle, which were for memorie onely, or for a meales meate or two, but as it were a showre of heauenly bread sufficient for a whole host, be it neuer so great; and as it were a whole cellar full of oyle vessels; whereby all our necessities may be prouided for, and our debts discharged. In a word, it is a Panary of wholesome foode, against fenowed traditions; a Physions-shop (Saint *Basill* calleth it) of preseruatives against poisoned heresies; a Pandect of profitable lawes, against rebellious spirits; a treasure of most costly iewels, against beggarly rudiments; Finally a fountaine of most pure water springing vp vnto euerlasting life. And what maruaile? The originall thereof being from heauen, not from earth; the authour being God, not man; the enditer, the holy spirit, not the wit of the Apostles or Prophets; the Pen-men such as were sanctified from the wombe, and endewed with a principall portion of Gods spirit; the matter, veritie, pietie, puritie, vprightnes; the forme, Gods word, Gods testimonie, Gods oracles, the word of trueth, the word of salvation, &c.; the effects, light of vnderstanding, stablenesse of perswasion, repentance from dead workes, newnesse of life, holinesse, peace, ioy in the Holy Ghost; lastly, the end and reward of the studie thereof, fellowship with the Saints, participation of the heauenly nature, fruition of an inheritance immortall, vndefiled, and that neuer shall fade away: Happie is the man that delighteth in the Scripture, and thrise happie that meditateth in it day and night."

They set to their work with a will and in the true spirit. Their piety and modesty are incidentally referred to:—

"And in what sort did these assemble? In the trust of their owne knowledge, or of their sharpenesse of wit, or deepenesse of iudgment, as it were in an arme of flesh? At no hand. They trusted in him that hath the key of *Dauid* opening and no man shutting; they prayed to the Lord, the Father of our

Lord, to the effect that *S. Augustine* did; 'O, let thy Scriptures be my pure delight, let me not be deceiued in them, neither let me deceiue by them.' In this confidence, and with this deuotion did they assemble together; not too many, lest one should trouble another; and yet many, lest many things haply might escape them."

When the task was completed at Oxford, Cambridge, and Westminster, three copies were sent to London and revised again by two from each company or place,¹ and this supervision occupied nine months. Thus the pages were considered by all the companies in succession, and Dr. Myles Smith and Dr. Bilson, "who carried prelature in his very aspect," and whose name does not appear among the revisers, superintended the work at press. But the account given by Samuel Ward, one of the revisers, in name of the English delegates (*Theologi Angli*) to the Synod of Dort in November, 1618, differs from that given in the previous paragraphs. It reduces the rules for the translators to seven, and says that twelve persons were selected for the final review.² On the other hand, it is recorded that Downes and Bois went up to London, and there met their "four fellow-labourers."³

This last revision required pecuniary expenditure, but it was not defrayed by the king, or from the funds of the church. Each of the revisers received thirty shillings a week, not, as Lewis reports, thirty pounds, which Barker seems to have paid. One authority says that the wages were paid by the Stationers' Company; but another writer on this subject, in 1651, asserts openly, "and forasmuch as propriety rightly considered is a legal relation of any one to a temporal good, I conceive the sole printing of the Bible and Testament, with power of restraint in others, to be of right the property of one Matthew Barker, citizen and stationer of London, in regard that his father paid for the amended or corrected translation of the Bible £3,500 by reason whereof the translated copy did

¹ Twelve persons in the one case and six in the other.

² *Acta Synodi Nat. Dordrecht.*, p. 27, 28.

³ *Life of John Bois*, by Dr. A. Walker, Harleian MSS., printed in Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*. See also Scrivener's Introduction, p. xiv.

of right belong to himself and his assigns."¹ According to the same author, Matthew Barker paid £600 for a reversionary patent in 1635.

After so long a period of anxious labour, carried out in the spirit of true scholarship and genuine piety, the new Bible was issued in 1611, under the title:—

"The Holy Bible, Conteyning the Old Testament and the New. Newly Translated out of the Originall tongues: and with the former Translations, diligently compared and revised by his Majesty's Speciall Commandement. Appointed to be read in Churches. Imprinted at London by Robert Barker, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty. Anno Dom. 1611."

It was published in handsome folio, and in that year there were two issues—one with a beautiful frontispiece, engraved on copper, by C. Boel, of Richmont. Which of the two issues is the earlier, it is difficult to say, especially after what Mr. Fry² of Bristol, Mr. Lenox³ of New York, and Dr. Scrivener,⁴ have written on both sides of the question. We are, however, still inclined to the more common opinion that the issue with Boel's engraving is the earlier of the two. The titles and sheets of the several editions were often craftily mixed up to deceive buyers into the belief that they were purchasing an early issue.

The volume was disfigured by a dedication of fulsome magniloquence to the king,—“the sun in his strength,” “that sanctified person, enriched with many singular and extraordinary graces,” “the wonder of the world in this latter age.” It concludes with a fling at the Puritans: “Or if, on the other side, we shall be maligned by self-conceited brethren, who run

¹ Quoted by Mr. Anderson in his *Annals*, vol. II, p. 384, and by Mr. Potts, M.A., and tutor in Cambridge, in his evidence before a select committee of the House of Commons, 1860, from a brief treatise “concerning the regulating of printing humbly submitted to the Parliament of England by William Ball, Esq., London, 1651.”

² A Description of the Great Bible, &c., and of the Authorized Version, &c., by Francis Fry, F.S.A., London, 1865.

³ Early Editions of King James's Bible in folio, New York, 1861.

⁴ Introduction to the Cambridge Paragraph Bible, 1873.

their own ways, and give liking unto nothing but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their anvil, we may rest secure, supported within by the truth and innocency of a good conscience, having walked the ways of simplicity and integrity, as before the Lord, and sustained without by the powerful protection of Your Majesty's grace and favour, which will ever give countenance to honest and Christian endeavours against bitter censures and uncharitable imputations.” The Preface, which, though it is composed in the elaborate style of the age, and gemmed with so many patristic quotations, is yet in many points of great excellence alike in tone and aim, in candour and criticism; in the points discussed, the arguments maintained, and the anticipations cherished as to the result both in church and land by the divine blessing. It is, however, as eulogistic of the king as is the Dedication: “This, and more to this purpose, His Maiestie that now reigneth (and long, and long may he reigne, and his offspring for euer, *Himselfe and children, and childrens children alwayes*) knew full well, according to the singular wisdom giuen vnto him by God, and the rare learning and experience that he hath attained vnto; namely that whosoever attempteth any thing for the publike (specially if it pertaine to Religion, and to the opening and clearing of the word of God) the same setteth himselfe vpon a stage to be glouted vpon by euery euil eye, yea, he casteth himselfe headlong vpon pikes, to be gored by euery sharpe tongue. For he that medleth with mens Religion in any part, medleth with their custome, nay, with their freehold; and though they finde no content in that which they haue, yet they cannot abide to heare of altering. Notwithstanding his Royall heart was not daunted or discouraged for this or that colour, but stood resolute, *as a statue immouable, and an anuile not easie to be beaten into plates*, as one sayth; he knew who had chosen him to be a Souldier, or rather a Captaine, and being assured that the course which he intended made much for the glory of God, & the building vp of his Church, he would not suffer it to be broken off for whatsoever speeches or practises.” A kind word is also said in defence of public burdens, and the sentences must have

highly pleased his majesty, who, with great need of his subjects' money, and an intense craving after it, imagined that he had an inherent claim upon it. "*David* was a worthy Prince, and no man to be compared to him for his first deedes, and yet for as worthy an acte as euer he did (euen for bringing backe the Arke of God in solemnitie) he was scorned and scoffed at by his owne wife. *Solomon* was greater than *David*, though not in vertue, yet in power: and by his power and wisdom he built a Temple to the Lord, such a one as was the glory of the land of Israel, and the wonder of the whole world. But was that his magnificence liked of by all? We doubt of it. Otherwise, why doe they lay it in his sonnes dish, and call vnto him for easing of the burden, *Make*, say they, *the grievous seruitude of thy father, and his sore yoke, lighter*. Belike he had charged them with some leuies, and troubled them with some cariages; Hereupon they raise vp a tragedie, and wish in their heart the Temple had neuer bene built. So hard a thing it is to please all, euen when we please God best, and do seeke to approue our selues to euery ones conscience."

The clause on the title-page, "Appointed to be read in churches," has, so far as is known, no authority, no edict of Convocation, no Act of Parliament, no decision of the Privy Council, no royal proclamation. At the same time, the new edition had virtual authority by the order of succession, by the law of entail and lineage; for it was made as a national book, by royal order, on purpose to displace the Bishops' Bible, and it had succeeded the Great Bible which had been formally authorized by the crown. The clause under review, it is said, has been sometimes understood as if it were connected with the previous words "by his majesty's special command." But its omission in some editions, especially of the New Testament, means nothing. When the two Testaments were bound up together, it was enough that it was printed on the first and general title-page which covered the whole volume, and it was engraven on the copper-plate title of the first edition. Yet the first folio in Roman character omits it, but that was in 1616. The first edition was meant to set the model for all subsequent

issues. The "churches" are only those in connection with the Established Church of England, "this whole church to be bound into it and none other," according to the minute of Conference. The Dedication, also, expressly declares, "we have great hopes that the Church of *England* shall reap great good thereby."¹ None but members of that church had any hand in the work. Yet the first letter of Genesis in the Bible has in it the rose and thistle. In the Preface Puritans are twice referred to in a somewhat scornful spirit, and also in the Dedication; while Archbishop Bancroft is called "the chief overseer under his majesty, to whom, not only we, but also our whole church was much bound."² The Puritan party that suggested the translation were not Nonconformists. Nor were they in sympathy with Scotch Presbyterians. Reynolds wrote in defence of the Liturgy, and Sparke in favour of conformity. His own party disowned Reynolds and his colleagues, as being "not of their nomination or choosing, or of one judgment" with them.³ The millenary petitioners disclaimed all connection with the Presbyterian and "popular party in the church, and with all separatists who sought the dissolution of the state ecclesiastical."

But it has been surmised that the Scottish Church was in some way represented by Galloway. Galloway had been a minister in Perth, many years before the time of the Conference, and had been one of the royal chaplains from 1589 to 1607. He had been obliged to fly for safety to England in 1584, because he had so resolutely preached against Lennox and Arran; and he had been "decourted" in 1601 "at the instance of the Queen." He wrote, as told in a previous page, an account of the meetings, which, after the king had revised it, he sent as "a just transumpt" down to the Presbytery of Edinburgh. But he was reckoned, in the phrase of the period, "a fallen star"; and in no sense did he

¹ And so Dr. Scrivener says that the "five clergymen who revised some of the Epistles, in or about 1858, benefited the English Church by revising its Authorized Version."

Criticism, p. 545, 2nd Edition, 1874.

² Bancroft died on the 2nd of November, 1610.

³ Neale's History of the Puritans, vol. I, p. 463.

represent the Church of Scotland; for he was employed as one of the royal tools in attempts to subvert its distinctive constitution; and these papers sent down to Edinburgh from Hampton Court were a portion of the process. His career, as a courtier, was so successful that his son was raised to the peerage by the title of Lord Dunkeld.¹ When the Edinburgh ministers were arbitrarily banished from the city, for refusing to accept, on all points, the king's account of the Gowrie conspiracy, Galloway preached vigorously in the royal defence, and applied to the sovereign without reserve the words and imagery in which the psalmist describes his great deliverances. Eight ministers were, indeed, summoned up from Scotland in 1606, but the points to be discussed by or before them were the royal prerogative and power to summon and dismiss ecclesiastical assemblies. The Scottish party would not listen to the voice of the charmer, though the voice was lordly and learned; the discourses of four episcopalian dignitaries produced no effect upon them, and so far from being employed in the work of translation, they were not only forbidden to attend church courts any more, but were severely punished. Andrew Melville, Principal of the University of St. Andrews, after being deprived of his academic office, was sent to the Tower² by a court which had no jurisdiction over him, and he obtained his liberty by exiling himself at the age of sixty-six. The others were bound to fix their dwellings in various places, many miles distant from the scenes of their usual pastoral labours. Melville had been so imprudent as to write a smart Latin epigram on the decorations of the altar in the royal chapel, and on being challenged for it he flared into high words with Bancroft, and twitted him with writing a book against the succession of

¹ This son became first "Master of Bequests and conjunct Secretary of State, along with the Earl of Stirling, and was elevated to the peerage in 1645. The third son joined the army of Claverhouse, and being outlawed after Killiecrankie, retired to the court of St. Germain, and the fourth son was an officer in

the French service." — Douglas's Peerage of Scotland, vol. I, p. 483.

² Adversity creates strange fellowships. Melville met Hamilton "the Skirmisher" (page 54) in the Tower, as a fellow-prisoner, got into friendly intercourse with him, and attended him with great kindness in his last moments.

James to the English crown. Producing the book from his pocket, and getting into closer than logical proximity to the enraged prelate, he shook him "freely and roundly by his popish rags."¹

The welcome which many in England gave to the new translation is gratefully expressed by Fuller: "And now, after long expectation and great desire, came forth the new translation of the Bible (most beautifully printed), by a select and competent number of divines appointed for that purpose; not being too many lest one should trouble another, and yet many lest any things might haply escape them; who, neither coveting praise for expedition, nor fearing reproach for slackness (seeing, in a business of moment, none deserve blame for convenient slowness), had expended almost three years in the work, not only examining the channels by the fountain, translations with the original, which was absolutely necessary; but also comparing channels with channels, which was abundantly useful, in the Spanish, Italian, French, and Dutch languages. So that their industry, skilfulness, piety, and discretion have therein bound the Church unto them in a debt of special remembrance and thankfulness. These, with Jacob, 'rolled away the stone from the mouth of the well' of life, Gen. xxix, 10; so that even Rachels, weak women, may freely come, both to drink themselves, and water the flocks of their families at the same."²

¹ Melville's Diary, p. 679. James's Scottish countrymen were far from being popular at this time, and their unpopularity was increased by the case of Calvin or of the *postnati*, the question being, What were the civil rights in England of persons born in Scotland since 1603? Were they aliens or not? When Guy Fawkes, on his trial, was asked by a Scottish peer why he had stored up

such a quantity of gunpowder, his sudden reply was, "To blow you beggarly Scotch back to your barren hills." So unpopular were Scotchmen in 1612, that three thousand of them passed homeward, through Ware, in ten days. Nichol's Progresses, vol. II, p. 649.

² Church History of Britain, vol. III, p. 245.

The name given in the Preface as "Efnard" should be "Einard," the abridger of the French Psalter, Ussher's Letter to Ward, Works, vol. XV, p. 291.

CHAPTER XLIV.

BUT while the Bishops' Bible was to be "as little altered" as possible, the revision was made by the constant use and comparison of the Hebrew and Greek originals. Their own words are: "If you aske what they had before them, truely it was the Hebrew text of the Olde Testament, the Greeke of the New. These are the two golden pipes or rather conduits where through the oliue branches emptie themselues into the golde. Saint *Augustine* calleth them precedent or originall tongues: Saint *Hierome* fountaines. The same Saint *Hierome* affirmeth, and *Gratian* hath not spared to put it into his Decree, 'That as the credit of the olde bookes (he meaneth of the Old Testament) is to be tryed by the Hebrew volumes, so of the New by the Greeke tongue (he meaneth by the originall Greeke.)' If trueth be to be tried by these tongues, then whence should a translation be made, but out of them? These tongues therefore, the Scripture wee say in these tongues, wee set before vs to translate, being the tongues wherein God was pleased to speake to His church by His prophets and apostles."

These translators had not, of course, the so-called *Textus Receptus* either of the Old or of the New Testaments—the former being the edition of Van der Hooght,¹ and the second that of the *Elzevirs*.² But of Hebrew Bibles they had a choice, as is shown in a statement on page 209. They had access also to the Complutensian Polyglott³ and to the Antwerp Poly-

¹ Amsterdam, 1705.

² Leyden, 1624.

³ The Old Testament is contained in vol. I-IV. The entire book, of which 600 copies were printed, was delayed in publication by the death of its patron on the 8th November, 1517, and Pope Leo

glott.¹ They had thus more than one edition which they could use, and they made some collations.

The Hebrew text of the Old Testament is far from being in a perfect state, and there are but scanty means of amending it. No Hebrew manuscripts are of very ancient date, few going beyond the twelfth century, and it is perilous to attempt to introduce alterations either from the Septuagint, the Samaritan Pentateuch, or the Targums. But the Masoretic notes bearing chiefly on the text are also grammatical, lexical, euphemistic, and exegetical, and they are abundant. Elias Levita reckoned them at 848, while Capell found no less than 1171. What is technically called the *Keri* and the *Chetib* refer to the spelling and pronunciation, but such various readings were not always regarded by the translators, who were quite capricious in their treatment. Thus the Masora gives fifteen instances where *lo* should be written so as to signify "to him"—and not to signify "not."² Thus in Isaiah ix, 3, in the clause "thou hast not increased the joy," which contradicts the rest of the verse, "they joy before Thee," the translators put the note "to him" into the margin—though it should have been in the text. In Exodus xxi, 8, "not" should be "to himself" as the Masora intimates, and this is accepted into the text without any remark. Words omitted altogether in the Hebrew text are supplied by the Masorets, and these supplements are accepted by the royal revisers usually, but not always, without any reference. On the other hand, spurious words are also marked, and the translators made their choice of text or margin, but not always with judicious preference.³ The extraordinary marks over words and letters have been often neglected. Thus in Judges xviii, 30, the *n* in the proper name *Manasseh* is so marked, the hanging form of the *n* denoting

did not license it till March 22nd, 1520. lation of Arias Montanus, which is a revision of that of Pagninus.

¹ The Antwerp Polyglott was published in 1569-72, and in addition to the text found in the Complutensian

it has a Chaldee paraphrase, the Syriac version and the Latin trans-

² לֹא to him ; לֹא not.

³ The same remark may be made to some extent about some of the writers in the Speaker's Commentary.

that the name should be Moses, the common reading having been devised to conceal the fact that this idolatrous priest was the son of Gershom and grandson of Moses.¹ There are eighteen corrections of the scribes (Tikkun Sopherim) sometimes conjectural and sometimes based on exegetical opinions. Gen. xviii, 22, might be "and Jehovah stood yet before Abraham." The reading which has been altered may be in many cases the original reading. Habakkuk i, 12, might read as Ewald prefers—"Art Thou not from everlasting." . . . "Thou diest not." Geiger usually adopts these readings.

Three readings of no moment are formally marked, Ezra x, 40, at the word "Machnadebai" the margin has or "Mabnadebai according to some copies." Psalms cii, 3, "my days are consumed like smoke," "or as some read into smoke." Cant. v, 4, "for him," "or as some read, in me." But there are at least sixty-seven notes referring to various readings of the Hebrew, generally pointed out on the margin by "or." In about half of them the Keri is given while the Chetib is kept in the text, but also in many cases the process is reversed. As these readings have generally the same initial mark as the alternative renderings, they are often not distinguished by the common reader.² They ignored, of course, the Masoretic notes at the end of each book—such notes as tell the number of the verses and letters in it, point out the middle verse, and mark the larger and shorter sections, with other similar minutiae. The revisers of the Old Testament were excellent Hebrew scholars, six of them then or afterwards held the chair of Hebrew at Oxford and Cambridge—Lively had held it for thirty years; Bedwell was of unrivalled fame as an Arabic scholar. Many parts of the Old Testament, especially in the Historical Books and the Psalms, are admirably done.³

¹ מִשֵּׁה.

² The list is given in Dr. Scrivener's Introduction to the Cambridge Paragraph Bible, p. 25.

³ Many acute and excellent remarks on the Hebrew text will be

found in Dr. Davidson's Hebrew text of the Old Testament (London, 1855), and many sound scholarly suggestions are contained in several parts of his volume "On a Fresh Revision of the English Old Testa-

They used their own judgment in selecting a Greek text of the New Testament. That which they generally used was the best within their reach at the time, and it is substantially that of Beza, 1589, it being taken from Stephens's folio of 1550, with some variations; while both Stephens and Beza were based on the fourth edition of Erasmus. The common statement is that in about eighty-one places they agree with Beza against Stephens; in about twenty-one places they agree with Stephens against Beza; while in twenty-nine places they follow neither, but are guided by Erasmus, the Vulgate, or the Complutensian Polyglott.¹ In places in the New Testament where they could not decide they gave an alternative in the margin, Beza being followed in the text, and Stephens put in the margin, or *vice versa*. Thus Matt. xxi, 7, "set him thereon," B,² instead of "he sat thereon," St.; xxiii, 13, 14, in the order of the verses, B.; Mark ix, 16, "with them," St.; margin, "or, among yourselves," after the rendering of the Vulgate and Beza, who adds that this is the reading of his oldest MS.;³ ix, 40, "he that is not against us," B., "you," St.; Luke ii, 38, "Jerusalem," St., margin, "or, Israel," after Beza's note; John xviii, 15,³ where the margin, without any explanation, abruptly reads, "And Annas sent Christ bound unto Caiaphas, the high priest,"—taken from the Bishops' Bible, and though not inserted by Beza into his last text, yet is justified by him; Rom. vii, 6, "that being dead wherein," B., margin, "or, being dead to

ment, London, 1873." See Delitzsch, Studies on the Complutensian Polyglott, Bagster and Sons, London, and the Delitzsch-Tregelles Handschriftl. Funde. Leipzig, 1861-63.

¹ The list with some variations is given by Canon Westcott in the article "New Testament" in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. II, p. 254; by Dr. Scrivener, in the introduction to the Cambridge Bible, appendix E; also by Professor Abbot of Harvard University. This last list would show that the

Authorized Version agrees with Beza of 1589 against Stephens of 1550 in about ninety places, with Stephens against Beza in about forty places, and that in about thirty to forty places it differs from both. There are cases in which it is impossible to decide the Greek reading from the English version. Schaff, Revision of the English Version, p. xxv, New York, 1873.

² B. is Beza; St. is Stephens.

³ ἐν ᾧ.

that," St.; viii, 11, "by his spirit," B., margin, "or, on account of his spirit," St.; 1 Peter i, 4, "for you," B., margin, "for us," St.; 2 Peter i, 3, "to glory," B., margin, "or, by," St.; Rom. v, 17, "by one man's offence," St., margin, "or, by one offence," B's Latin; Gal. iv, 17, "they would exclude you," St., margin, "or, us," B. In Heb. x, 2, the interrogative form is from Stephens, "for then would they not have ceased to be offered?" margin, "or, they would have ceased to be offered," B. In Matt. ii, 11, x, 10, 2 Peter i, 1, they forsake both Beza and Stephens; in John xviii, 1, Acts xxviii, 29, they prefer the reading of the Vulgate, and from it also is taken the alternative rendering of the margin in Matt. xxiv, 31, "or, with a trumpet, and a great voice."

But different readings in the New Testament are also formally inserted in the margin. There are thirty-five such textual notes, and the following are a sample of them: Matt. i, 11, margin, "Some read, Josias begat Jakim, and Jakim begat Jechonias," a marginal reading of Stephens, but of no authority—first accepted by Beza, and then rejected by him in his third edition. Matt. xxvi, 26, "Jesus took bread and blessed it"; margin, "Many Greek copies have, Gave thanks." Their text follows Stephens and Beza, and the note is based on Beza, who says that "gave thanks" is read in some old codices, and that both words are used in Mark, viii, 6, 7, in reference to the same meal, adding some further thoughts on, or rather against, transubstantiation. But the reading is baseless, being introduced from the usage of Luke and Paul. Luke x, 22, at the beginning of the verse the margin says, "Many ancient copies add these words, And turning to his disciples, he said." In omitting this clause from their text, they deserted Stephens and followed Beza. The reading has, however, some manuscript authority, and some of the oldest versions, and is accepted by Tischendorf in his seventh edition, and even in his eighth, though the Sinaitic MS. omits it. It is omitted by Tregelles, and bracketed by Alford. Luke xvii, 36, "Two men shall be in the field, the one shall be taken and the other left"; margin, "This verse is wanting in most of the Greek copies,"—yet it is kept in the text after Beza, who says that it is in the Syriac, the

Complutensian, and some old codices. Erasmus and Stephens both omitted it; it has some support in versions, but MSS. are against it. Acts xxv, 6, "more than ten days"; margin, "Or as some copies read, No more than eight or ten days,"—the reading of the Vulgate, Syriac, and Coptic versions, and now accepted on great diplomatic authority. Ephesians vi, 9, "knowing that your master is also in heaven"; margin, "Some read, Both your and their master," and this is now the accepted reading, supported by preponderant evidence. Here, again, they follow Beza, and he admits the various reading in his own Latin version.¹ James ii, 18, "Show me thy faith without thy works"; margin, "Some copies read, By thy works," but these copies are of little weight. Beza rejected the reading "by thy works" as very frigid and jejune; but Stephens keeps it, and notes the other in the margin. 1 Peter ii, 21, "because Christ also suffered for us"; margin, "Some read, for you,"—Beza affirming that the reading "you" is rashly corrupted "to bring the clause into correspondence with the person of the previous verse." Stephens puts the reading in his margin. But there is every authority for "suffered for you," "leaving you." No uncial MS. reads "for us," "leaving us"; though two read with the Vulgate "suffered for us," "leaving you." 2 Peter ii, 2, "their pernicious ways"; margin, "or lascivious ways, as some copies read"—Stephens and Beza are followed—Beza quoting the Vulgate, the Complutensian, and six MSS. The reading preferred by our translators has no manuscript authority. 2 Peter ii, 11, "railing accusation against them"; margin, "Some read, against themselves," a various reading of no value in the margin of Stephens, and condemned by Beza.² 2 Peter ii, 18, "those that are clean escaped"; margin, "Or, for a little, or a while," as some read. The reading rests on high authority. Stephen notes it in his margin. Beza prefers *paubulum*, but his note has a polemical tinge. 2 John 8, "that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive"; margin, "Some copies read, which ye have gained, but that ye receive, &c." Stephens notices the reading in his margin

¹ Et illorum et vester dominus.

² The Vulgate having *adversum se*, and Erasmus *adversus sese*.

which is that of the Vulgate, and there are variations. Finally, the last clause of 1 John ii, 23, is thus printed, "[*but*] *he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also.*" The italics are not employed, as usually, to mark a supplement, but to show that the words were regarded as suspicious. Why they should have chosen such a method of indication in this place only, it is impossible to conjecture. Stephens excluded the clause, but has a reference to it in the margin. Beza, however, admits it without hesitation, nay, vindicates his restoration of it from MSS., the Vulgate, and the style of the Apostle, which is very often marked by such antitheses. The clause rests on undoubted authority. Beza was followed in some doubtful cases, but here he is followed timidly, and no marginal comment is added. They imitate the Bishops' and the Great Bible in their mode of printing it, while Tyndale and Coverdale omit it altogether.¹

They were wisely forbidden to append theological notes, but they vindicate in their preface the necessity and benefit of marginal renderings. "Some, peradventure, would haue no varietie of sences to be set in the margine, lest the authoritie of the Scriptures for deciding of controuersies by that show of vncertaintie, should somewhat be shaken. But we hold their judgmēt not to be so sound in this point. For though whatsoever things are necessary, are manifest, as S. Chrysostome saith, and S. Augustine. In those things that are plainly set downe in the Scriptures all such matters are found that concern faith, hope, and charitie. Yet for all that it cannot be dissembled, that partly to exercise and whet our wits, partly to weane the curious from loathing of them for their euerywhere-plainnesse, partly also to stirre vp our deuotion to craue the assistance of Gods spirit by prayer, and lastly that

¹The margin of the New Testament of Robert Stephens, 1550, is not of great value. He did not print all the various readings which his son Henry had gathered, nor did he fully collate all the sixteen MSS., affirmed by him to be in his

own possession, and some of which have not as yet been identified. His text usually differs from the majority of the readings in the margin, and in nineteen places it disagrees with them all.

we might be forward to seek ayd of our brethren by conference, and never to scorn those that be not in all respects so complete as they should bee, being to seeke in many things our selues, it hath pleased God in his diuine providence, heere and there to scatter wordes and sentences of that difficultie and doubtfulness, not in doctrinal points that concerne saluation, (for in such it hath been vouched that the Scriptures are plaine) but in matters of lesse moment." In this spirit, in addition to textual notes, they appended 6,637 marginal notes to the Old Testament—two-thirds of these expressing the more literal meaning of the Hebrew or Chaldee, having "Heb." or "Chald." prefixed, and of the remainder 2,156 contain alternative renderings, proper names are explained in 63, 240 contain an attempt to harmonize the text especially as to the spelling of proper names, 108 of these naturally belonging to the Books of Chronicles.¹ In the New Testament they placed 765—of these 35 state various readings, 582 are alternative renderings, 112 give more literal translations, and, quite in contrast to the > Genevan, only 35 present explanations.

Many of the Notes, especially in the Old Testament, explain symbolic names like those in Hosea i, ii; and sometimes the Hebrew geographical name is put in the margin, when another term has been put into the text, as Cush, Ethiopia; Aram, Mesopotamia; Ararat, Armenia. When a Hebrew or a foreign term is kept in the text, it is occasionally explained in the margin: as Jasher, "of the upright," 2 Samuel i, 18; mammon, "riches," Luke xvi, 11; but they attach no note to Raca in Matt. v, 22. And, conversely, the original term "teraphim" is carried to the margin, "images" remaining in the text, Gen. xxxi, 19; "the giant" is reserved for the text, "Rapha" relegated to the margin, 2 Sam. xxi, 16; "Praise ye the Lord" is in the text, and "Hallelujah" in the margin, Psalm cvi, 1, but no note is given to the same clause just before the conclusion of the previous Psalm. They were in great

¹1 Chron. i, 6, Riphath in the text is Diphath in the margin; 7, 1,016 marginal notes in the Apocrypha. Dodanim, Rodanim; 17, Meshech, crypha. Mash; 30, Hadad, Hadar. Ac-

doubt as to the meaning of two names in Isaiah lxv, 11, and they put the Hebrew terms "Gad," "Meni," in the margin; and they felt a similar bewilderment at Ezekiel xliii, 15. A more literal rendering than that of the text is frequently set in the margin: Gen. xxxi, 2, "as yesterday and the day before"; 1 Kings i, 25, "let king Adonijah live"; Psalms ii, 6, "anointed" "upon Zion the hill of my holiness." There are also alternative renderings, as if giving the reader his choice: Gen. vii, 11, "windows," margin, "flood-gates"; i, 6, "firmament," margin, "expansion"; Gen. xxxi, 54, "offered sacrifices," margin, "killed beasts"; Exodus xii, 6, "in the evening," margin, "between the two evenings"; Psalms xviii, 26, "thou wilt show thy self froward," margin, "wrestle." Geographical annotations are sometimes found: 2 Kings xxiii, 13, "mount of Corruption," margin, "that is, the mount of Olives"; 2 Chron. ix, 26, "the river," margin, "that is, Euphrates"; Acts xxvii, 7, "Crete," margin, "or, Candy." There are a few general notes interspersed¹: Gen. vi, 5, margin, "the Hebrew word signifieth not only the imagination, but also the purposes and desires"; Exodus xxix, 13, on "caul,"² the margin is, "It seemeth by anatomy and the Hebrew doctors to be the midriff"; 2 Samuel xxiv, 1, "he made David to number," margin, "Satan"; Job x, 17, "thy witness," margin, "that is, thy plagues"; xii, 13, "with him," margin, "that is, with God"; xxvii, 3, "spirit of God," margin, "that is, the breath which God gave"; Psalms xxiv, 6, "Jacob," margin, "or, O God of Jacob." In John xviii, verse 24 is made a note to verse 13; Acts xvii, 19, "Areopagus," margin, "or, Mars' hill. It was the highest court in Athens"; 1 Cor. xi, 10, "power," margin, "that is, a covering or sign

¹ These examples, inserted by the revisers themselves, belong to the first edition. The notes were vastly multiplied in subsequent issues, and without authority.

² It may be added that in Hosea xiii, 8, the caul of the heart is mentioned, that is, the membrane en-

closing the heart. The name is also given in Isaiah iii to some species of network that formed a portion of female head-dress. But in the Hebrew text of Exodus, Isaiah, and Hosea three different words are employed.

epitaphium.

that she is under the power of her husband." There is also a note of some length to Acts xiii, 34, and to Mark vii, 3. Explanations of weights and of measures, and of terms denoting distances are also given. But there are no historical notes, for they are virtually an interpretation based on some scheme of chronology. The Bibles in common currency and use have many of these historical notes, but the translators themselves did not append them. They are therefore in no way responsible for the notes at Judges iii, 31; iv, 2; xi, 29; xii, 8, 11, 13; xiii, 1; xv, 20; 1 Sam. iv, 18; 2 Kings i, 17; viii, 17; 1 Chron. i, 50; Daniel i, 21; ix, 24; Hosea xiii, 10. Nor are they responsible for the reference to Josephus in Genesis xxii, 1, and 2 Kings xiv, 8; or for that to Ussher, 2 Kings xv, 30; or for the prefatory note to the Book of Job; nor that on Psalm lx, 8; or Hosea ix, 3; or for that at the beginning of 2 Kings xv, in which the word "monarchy" occurs in the sense of "sole reign." All those are later interpolations, and have been brought in from time to time without recognized authority; 269 of such notes first appeared in the edition of Dr. Paris, 1762; and Dr. Blayney added 66 additional annotations. A large group of these notes may be seen at the end of Daniel ix, the one note of the first edition being omitted altogether. The chronology of Archbishop Ussher has also been inserted, and is now found in the most of Bibles, though it has not a satisfactory basis. It is startling to find that the epoch of the creation, the deluge, and the call of Abram is given without any misgiving, while Job is assigned to about 1520 B.C., and 1,000 years B.C. runs through the first twenty-four chapters of Proverbs, and then 300 years are suddenly deducted, and it becomes "about B.C. 700." There are no distinct chronological data given in the earlier chapters of Genesis. For it is said x, 15, "Canaan begat Sidon his firstborn, and Heth," but the next clause adds the names of tribes begotten by him, "the Jebusite and the Amorite," &c., a mode of expression that makes a very large and indefinite demand on time. The date assigned to the earthquake, B.C. 787, is certainly not correct, nor can 862, prefixed to Jonah, be the true year.

It would be a great exaggeration to say that the marginal renderings are better than those of the text, but not a few of them certainly are preferable, as those attached to Gen. xxi, 33; Deut. xxi, 23; Josh. xx, 7; Psalm ii, 6; xxix, 2; Prov. iv, 23; Ezek. xxix, 10; Matt. ii, 6, 11; v, 21; xxii, 20; xxiii, 18; Mark vii, 3; x, 52; John i, 12; xiv, 18; Acts xiii, 36; xvii, 23; xix, 38, 39; xxv, 20; xxvii, 40; Romans iii, 25; vii, 7; Galatians iv, 25; Ephesians i, 19; vi, 24; 1 Thess. i, 4; 2 Thess. i, 7; Titus, ii, 11; Hebrews ii, 16; vi, 7, 17; vii, 3, 28; 2 Peter iii, 12; 3 John 14; Rev. iii, 14, &c., &c. Yet no one will fully adopt the statement of Gell, "that the translators have placed some different significations in the margent, but these mostwath the better, because where truth is tried by most voyces it is commonly outvoted."¹

The fourteenth rule given to the translators exhorted them, in cases of doubt and difficulty, to consult Tyndale, Matthew, Coverdale, Whitchurch, Geneva. The order is peculiar, in that it places Matthew before Coverdale, and calls the Great Bible by the name of one of its printers—Whitchurch.² The reference to Matthew was superfluous, as his Bible is simply made up of Tyndale and Coverdale. This rule the translators did not specially regard, for they knew that these versions were a series of revisions, and therefore they revised the Bishops' by the help of its contemporary, the Genevan. In fact, they clung as closely to it as to the Bishops', though they often differ with advantage from both. In the historical books they keep near the Bishops'. The royal condemnation of the Genevan did not affect them, but they gave it its just place in their estimation, and, especially in the prophetic books, adopt it as often as they adopt the Bishops'. Professor Moulton's exact calculation is that, in one hundred and eighty-two words of six verses, Isaiah liv, 11-17, eighty remain unchanged from the previous versions, sixty are from the Genevan, and only twelve are from the Bishops'.³ In the familiar fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, Canon Westcott has counted that of the

¹ Essay toward the Amendment of the last English Translation, preface p. 24, London, 1659.

² Whitchurch had married the widow of Cranmer.

³ Bible Educator, vol. IV, p. 380.

variations seven-eighths are due to the Genevan.¹ And they made use of another version, not mentioned to them at all—the Rheims.² The Genevan represented an extreme section of Protestant English refugees, and the Rheims a party of extreme Popish exiles; but they profited by the consultation of both versions. Many happy turns were borrowed from the one, and from the other they enriched their vocabulary, though they avoided the theological notes of the first, and did not accept the swarm of Latinized terms that disfigure the second. Instances of the happy use of the Genevan and the Rheims are to be found everywhere.

They had also other helps, as they record in their Preface: "Neither did wee thinke much to consult the translators and commentators—Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greeke, or Latine, no, nor the Spanish, French, Italian, or Dutch; neither did we disdain to reuise that which we had done, and to bring back to the anuill that which we had hammered: but hauing and vsing as great helpees as were needfull, and fearing nor eproch for slownesse, nor coueting praise for expedition, wee haue at the length, through the good hand of the Lord vpon us, brought the worke to that passe that you see." These more modern versions were probably a Spanish translation, De Regna, 1569, and a revision of it by Cyprian De Valera,³ Amsterdam, 1602; a French translation by Olivetan, 1535, and by the Company of Pastors, Geneva, in 1587-88; an Italian translation by Diodati, Geneva, 1607. Of course, they had Luther's Bible; and if Dutch is to be distinguished from German, then a Dutch translation had been published in 1560 based on Luther's version. They had also Pagninus, the edition of Arias Montanus, and Münster. They were very familiar with the translation of the Old Testament by Tremellius, Frankfort, 1575-76-79; and its second edition, under the care of Junius, his son-in-law, Geneva, 1590. The Targum of Onkelos had been printed several times before 1611, and also

¹ History of the English Bible, powder Plot had been discovered on p. 274. the 5th of November, 1605.

² King James at that time de-
³ See some account of De Valera tested the Papists, and the Gun- in Thomsons' Fasti, vol. II, p. 353.

that of Jonathan Ben Uzziel. The Peshito also had been published, as was also the Latin version of Castalio, 1551.

One glimpse into their method of procedure is given by Selden: "The English translation of the Bible is the best translation in the world, and renders the sense of the original best, taking in for the English translation the Bishops' Bible, as well as King James's. The translators in King James's time took an excellent way. That part of the Bible was given to him who was most excellent in such a tongue—as the Apocrypha to Andrew Downes; and then they met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues, or French, Spanish, Italian, &c. If they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on."

The alternative renderings which they place in the margin show what helps they had been consulting for the text. Thus in Isaiah xl, apart from the more literal renderings of Hebrew idioms, the following marginal notes may be taken as an example: 1, "her warfare is accomplished," Genevan,¹ but the alternative rendering, "appointed time,"² is from Tremellius; 4, "and the rough [places] made plaine," B., G.B.³—marginal rendering, "a plain place";⁴ 9, "O Zion, that bringest good tidings! O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings!"—B. and Genevan being virtually the same, after Pagninus, Münster, and Leo Judæ; but the marginal rendering, "O thou that tellest good tidings to Zion," is from Tremellius,⁵ the Septuagint adopting the former, and the Vulgate the latter.⁶ 10, "The Lord God will come with strong hand," "with power," G. and B.;⁷ but the dissimilar margin, "against the strong," is again from Tremellius.⁸ "His work before him"—similar in G. and B., after Pagninus, Münster, and Leo Judæ;⁹ while the margin, "or recompense for his

¹ "Militia completa"—Pagninus and Münster.

² "Tempus præfinitum."

³ B. is Bishops'; G.B., the Gt. Bible.

⁴ "In planitiem"—Pagninus and Münster.

⁵ "O quæ evangelizas Zijoni."

⁶ "Qui evangelizas Zijoni."

⁷ "Cum forti," Pagninus.

⁸ "Contra robustum."

⁹ "Opus ejus ante ipsum."

work," is virtually after Castalio.¹ 11, "those that are with young," virtually after G. and B.;² but the marginal reading is correct, "that give suck," and is from the French version of 1588.³ 14, "and who instructed him" G.; margin, "Hebrew, made him understand," literal, after Coverdale and the Zürich German.⁴ 22, "It is he that sitteth"; margin, "or him that sitteth."⁵ 31, "shall renew their strength," Tremellius, after Leo Judæ; margin, "or, change," Vulgate.⁶ The Hebrew verb means to exchange strength, or get new strength.

The royal revisers were somewhat independent in their appropriation and in their rejection of the renderings found in the preceding versions.

The Bishops' was the translation which was immediately revised by royal order, and it therefore had its own influence in moulding the Authorized Version. But it was changed in many ways, though now and then both its text and margin are retained, as in 2 Cor. viii, 22; or sometimes the text of the Bishops' becomes the margin of the Authorized, as in 2 Thess. iii, 14; Ephes. iv, 1; and the margin of the Bishops' the text of the Authorized, as in Gal. vi, 12; 2 Pet. i, 20. The revisers often followed the earlier versions in places where change would have been profitable, but sometimes they have introduced alterations to the worse. A few examples may be given:

Mark xii, 44, "they did cast in of their abundance,"⁷ from the Rheims and the Vulgate, superseding the better reading, "superfluity," of the Bishops', and all the preceding versions.

The older translations are rightly forsaken in Mark vi, 29, in the rendering "corpse"; "body" being the earlier rendering, the Genevan having "or carcase" in the margin.

On the other hand, the Authorized follows the older versions in wrongly rendering "but" in 1 Thess. ii, 18, "but"⁸

¹ "Præmium suumque."

² "Fœtas," Vulgate, Münster, Pagninus, and Leo Judæ.

³ "Celles qui allaitent," Luther having "die Schaffmütter."

⁴ "Das er in verständig mache."

⁵ "Eum qui insidet," Tremellius.

⁶ "Novas vires recipiunt," Leo Judæ; "mutabunt" being the verb in the Vulgate, followed by Pagninus, Münster; "mutant vires" in Tremellius.

⁷ Quod abundabat illis.

⁸ καὶ.

Satan hindered us"; the contrast is not expressed by the conjunction, but lies in the context, the particle simply adding another fact in sequence, as in Hebrew narration.

Acts i, 4, the translation "being assembled together with them" is better than "and gaddered them together"—the rendering of all the older versions but the Rheims, which, after Wycliffe, has "and eating with them"—found in our margin.

In Heb. iv, 1, the older versions have "let us fear, therefore, lest any of us forsaking the promise of entering," but the Authorized Version boldly alters, and gives "a promise being left us of entering." In a more important place it forsakes the older versions, and mistranslates the original—"the promises . . . having seen them afar off and embraced them."

✓ The proper rendering is "saluted them," for the privation of the fathers was that they could not embrace them. Wycliffe has "greetynge"; so Tyndale, Coverdale, the Great Bible, the Bishops', and the Rheims; but the Genevan versions have, the one "received them thankfully" (1560), and the other "with thanks" (1557). Our translators have also so rendered the verb in Acts xx, 1, thus in some way identifying salute and embrace.

The Authorized Version also follows the older versions, in shrinking from the full and literal sense of the first clause of 2 Pet. iii, 12, when it renders "hasting *unto* the coming of the day of God," the insertion of "unto" being unwarranted. Believers are exhorted to speed the coming of the day of God. The true translation—"hasting the coming"—is relegated to the margin, as if it had been felt to be too adventurous to put it into the text. ". . . that it may please thee . . . to hasten thy kingdom" (Burial Service).

In a similar way, and apparently from a similar motive, the true sense is departed from in Acts iii, 19, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come." Without doubt the conjunction¹ signifies "in order that." Two ends are spoken of as the twin result of their conversion—first, "that your sins may be blotted out"; and secondly, "that seasons of refreshing

¹ ὅπως.

may come"; these seasons, connected with the second advent or mission of Jesus, at the restitution of all things. The second advent is thus conditioned in its period by the state of the world and the church; but our translators, not being able to entertain the notion, render the conjunction by "when"; and to show that they felt some necessity laid upon them, this is the only place where it is so translated. The older versions have the same misrendering; the Genevan of 1557 has "since," but the note in the margin of the Bishops' hints at the true reference.

It forsakes its predecessor in rendering Heb. ii, 16, "he took not on *him* the nature of angels," the true rendering being put into the margin, and the false translation probably suggested by the marginal note of the Bishops'. The verse is not an assertion of the incarnation, but an inferential argument for it.

Matt. xiv, 8, "And she being before instructed of her mother," does not give the sense with its peculiar point; it is rather, "and she being put forward (set on) by her mother." Our version is based upon the Vulgate,¹ and it may be traced through the Bishops', the Genevan, the Great Bible, Matthew, and Coverdale, up to Tyndale, who has "beinge informed of her mother before."

It follows Tyndale, the Great Bible, the Genevan, and the Bishops', and misrenders Acts ii, 6, "now when this was noised abroad" ("about" in the older versions), putting the better translation into the margin, "when this voice was made." Coverdale and the Rheims have "voice." The noun never signifies report or rumour, and refers to the "sound" of v. 2, and means when that sound had taken place.

In the injunction, "abstain from all appearance of evil," 1 Thess. v, 22, "appearance" is properly what presents itself to the eye—form or figure, as in Luke iii, 22; ix, 29; John v, 37; and in 2 Cor. v, 7. But the word does not mean semblance without reality, though the sense suggested by the English translation, which copies the Genevan rendering, is, avoid what bears the aspect of evil, though it be not really

¹ Præmonita a matre.

evil; or, as Tyndale has it, "all suspicious things."¹ The contrast is not between what is really good, and is to be held fast, and what is evil only in appearance.

Mark vi, 20, "Herodias would have killed him, but she could not; for Herod observed him" (Bishops' and Genevan)—rather "preserved"—shielded him from her malignity,

The older versions are followed in giving a rendering to Luke xxiii, 15, which takes away all sense from the passage, "No, nor yet Herod; for I sent you to him, and lo, nothing worthy of death is done unto him"; for the rendering should be not "unto him," but "by him." Pilate had said, "I find no fault in him," and he adds that Herod had come to a similar conclusion—nothing had been done by him that could entail capital punishment.

"Cumber," now all but obsolete, may be supposed to have the same meaning as "encumber" in Luke xiii, 7, "why cumbereth it the ground?" Such a translation, however, does not represent the verb of the original, but is probably due to the *occupat* of the Vulgate, Wycliffe having "wherto occupieth it the erthe?" and the Rheims, "whereto also doth it occupy the ground." "Cumber" was introduced by Tyndale, and Coverdale has "why hyndreth it the ground?"² But these translations amount only to this—"Why does it take up so much of the soil?" the Genevan advancing a step, and giving "why keepeth it also the ground barren?" The sense has its point in the "also," and the verb means to destroy the ground, for the tree was *pernicious* as well as fruitless. It is quite a different verb that is rendered "cumbered" in Luke x, 40, "Martha was cumbered with much service."

"Blindness" instead of "hardness" is wrong in Rom. xi, 25; Ephes. iv, 18, after the Vulgate,³ but it is rightly rendered "hardness" in Mark iii, 5—the rendering also of the Genevan.

Gal. vi, 11 is misrendered in the Authorized Version, following Tyndale, the Great Bible, and the Genevan, "ye see how large a letter I have written." The true and literal translation is, "ye see with how large letters I have written," the allusion

¹ The Vulgate reads "ab omni mala specie."
² "Impedit" in the old Latin.

³ *Cæcitas*.

being to the large characters which, from age, infirmity, or want of experience in writing Greek, his own hand had traced on the parchment.

It rightly forsakes the earlier versions in John i, 3, 4, by rendering "him" instead of "it," and has thus followed the Rheims, and Wycliffe, who reads, "alle thingis weren maad bi hym."

In 2 Thess. ii, 2, the clause "as that the day of Christ is at hand" does not present the true meaning, which is "as that the day of the Lord is present." The participle denotes "present," and it is so rendered rightly in Rom. viii 38; 1 Cor. iii, 22; vii, 26; Gal. i, 4; Heb. ix, 9. The belief that the day of the Lord had come upon them was spreading in the Thessalonian Church, and many, in consequence of the delusion, had become unsettled, and had ceased to work. All the older versions have "at hand," and Wycliffe has "be nigh."

The rendering of James v, 16, "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much," is so far tautological, since to be effectual and to be of much avail are not very different. The translation gives a double sense to the participle, and the more literal rendering is, "the prayer of a righteous man availeth much, as it worketh." Tyndale has, and he has been followed in the main, "the prayer of a righteous man availeth much, if it be fervent." The Great Bible has "the fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much"; the Rheims, after Wycliffe, "the continual prayer of a just man." The participle is middle, and means, as it works, or puts out its power.

The revisers were aware that words used in such a volume as theirs would win for themselves a lasting place in the language, and they therefore used great caution; their own defence being, "We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some vnequall dealing towards a great number of good English words . . . if wee should say, as it were, vnto certaine words, Stand vp higher, have a place in the Bible alwayes, and to others, of like qualitie, Get ye hence, be banished for euer." And the English tongue is worthy of this loving guardianship. Other languages in Europe—French, Italian, and German,—have little prevalence beyond the limits

of the old territories; but England has been a "mother of nations"—her little island is but a point in comparison with her immense colonial empire, her language has been conveyed to all quarters of the globe, and there are also many millions speaking her tongue that owe her no allegiance.

The translation as a whole is excellent, and has elicited many encomiums from all classes of critics and scholars. There are some renderings equivocal, and some wrong; and a chief blemish is the want of uniformity in rendering the same terms—a liberty which was taken on purpose, for it is vindicated in the Preface.

Grimm affirms of English that "in wealth, wisdom, and strict economy none of the living languages can vie with it."¹ King James's scholarly revisers were conscious of possessing such an instrument, and their English style is above all praise. They did not give us the English of their own day, but their great merit consisted in so fully retaining the simple and racy idioms of the earlier versions. English was in its first vigour when Tyndale consecrated it in his New Testament, and its consecration has preserved it in immortal youth. The language of common life became hallowed and dignified by the service to which it had been yoked. The Authorized Version has in it the traces of its origin, and its genealogy may be reckoned. For while it has the fulness of the Bishops' without its frequent literalisms or its repeated supplements, it has the graceful vigour of the Genevan, the quiet grandeur of the Great Bible, the clearness of Tyndale, the harmonies of Coverdale, and the stately theological vocabulary of the Rheims. It has thus a complex unity in its structure—all the earlier versions ranging over eighty years having bequeathed to it contributions the individuality of which has not been in all cases toned down. Some clauses tell their origin by their lucid distinctness and others by their rhythm, some are more precise and others more easy. While some of the older terms are excluded, others are at the

¹ We may quote another and different opinion: "Did not you hear us speak? . . . I do; and surely it is a sleepy language." *Tempest*, Shakespeare.

same time introduced. The "cratch"¹ of the Genevan went out, but "settle"² came in. The revisers dropped the "pill"³ of Tyndale, and, ignoring the Bishops', they preserve the "demand"⁴ of the Great Bible in its French sense. Setting aside "strike" and "knock" of the older revisions, they introduce the picturesque rendering "tabering"⁵ "on their breast." Letting go the expression "fardels"⁶ of the Genevan, and not content with the "burdens" of the Bishops' and the Great Bible, they put in its room "carriages," a term quite obsolete now in their meaning of it, and they were so fond of it, that they have used it five times in the text and twice in the margin. They did not admit "disease"⁷ as a verb, though it was in Biblical use, but they have "bettered"⁸ in reference to malady; passing over the more familiar "platter" they give us "charger,"⁹ a word in this sense long unused. Like the tree which sucks kindlier nurture from a soil enriched by its own fallen leaves, our Bible is the outgrowth of many years and many minds, the aim ever being to give to the English people, not a mere literary luxury, but a book which all ranks and classes should easily understand and enjoy.¹⁰

For the version must ever be admired for its simple dignity and quaint terseness, its archaic tinge, its rhythmic cadences and idiomatic felicities. It is homely but not vulgar, and musical without the aid of tawdry expletives. Having kept its place for more than two centuries and a half, it has

¹ Luke ii, 7, 12.

² Ezekiel xliii, 14, 17; xlv, 19. It is still a provincial or homely term.

³ 2 Cor. xii, 17, preserved in the Bishops', "did I pill you?" but in the Authorized, "did I make a gain?"

⁴ Matt. ii, 4.

⁵ Nahum ii, 7, "tabring," in the first edition sometimes spelt "tabouring," allied in origin to tabret. Gen. xxxi, 27.

⁶ Acts xxi, 15, "trussed up our

fardels," in modern phrase, made up our packs or personal baggage.

⁷ Mark v, 35, "why diseasedst thou the Master?" both in the Bishops' and Genevan, after Tyndale.

⁸ Mark v, 26.

⁹ Matt. xiv, 8.

¹⁰ King James, though he had Latin and Latinized Scotch at easy and ever-flowing command, yet had the good judgment and good taste to say, in the "*Basilicon Doron*," to his son, "Be plain and smooth in your own language."

"waxed old," but it has not "decayed." Obsolete words do occur in it, but the version, so far from being dry and dead, is fresh and living as the rod of Aaron, which on being laid up before the ark "budded and bloomed blossoms and yielded almonds." Though it may vary with the themes of the original, it never loses its identity. So quiet and clear in narrative, so direct and urgent in precept, so fervid and spiritual in the psalter, so impressive and magnificent in the prophets, it bears upon it the imagery of the Hebrew lyrics without being overborne by it, and gives earnest and impressive utterance to apostolical argument and appeal.

The spirit of all the sacred writers lives in the English translation. The immediate and fervid utterances of the Semitic temperament filled with the divine life clothe themselves as with a native fitness in our English tongue, and have for all time ennobled and sanctified it. The Bible, the creation of Hebrew genius, has proved itself adapted to universal circulation. Originating in the east, reflecting its hues and lighted up with its splendours, it has yet in the west found a welcome and a home, and has become without effort or awkwardness the natural vehicle of song and supplication to myriads of the children of Japhet. The syllables of the Lord's prayer drop gently from the lips of a child; and they fill the mouth of an "aged disciple." Many who are strangers to the spiritual power of the English Bible bow to its literary beauties. The charm and tenderness of the parables are not lost by difference of language—the evangelists speak as touchingly in English as in Greek.

Exception has indeed been taken to the translation of the Old Testament on account of some literal renderings of Hebrew clauses and epithets, as if they were "abhorrent" from the English idiom. But not a few Hebrew phrases are now deeply imbedded in our language, and from familiarity with them no one feels that they are foreign, such as "God of peace," "God of all grace," "Father of lights," "Sun of righteousness," "Son of peace," "man of sin," "robe of righteousness," "song of songs," "ways of pleasantness," "oil

of gladness," "trees of Jehovah," "man of sorrows," "Son of man," "the Ark of thy strength," "Rock of Ages," a favourite phrase of a favourite hymn, is a literal translation in the margin of Isaiah xxvi, 4, the text having a far feebler rendering, "everlasting strength." But while they so often preserve or imitate some Hebrew idioms, they have no small merit in rendering others into terse and felicitous English. Especially in the frequent instances of an infinitive construct in combination with its own finite verb, they have shown ingenious versatility. This combination indicated certainty in reference to a past act: Gen. xxvi, 28, "we saw *certainly* that the Lord was with thee"; Exod. iii, 7, "I have *surely* seen"; 1 Sam. ii, 30, "I said *indeed*."

The idiom is also intensive, and they render it in various ways:—

Gen. ii, 16, "thou mayest *freely* eat"; iii, 4, "ye shall not *surely* die"; and similarly xviii, 18, xx, 7, and xxviii, 22; xxxi, 30, "thou wouldest *needs* be gone, because thou *sore* longest."

Exod. iv, 14, "he can speak *well*."

Josh. xxiii, 13, "know *for a certainty*."

2 Sam. xvii, 16, "but *speedily* pass over"; xx, 18, "they *were wont* to speak."

1 Chron. iv, 10, "O that thou wouldest bless me *indeed*."

Esther iv, 14, "if thou *altogether* holdest thy peace."

Job vi, 2, "O that my grief were *thoroughly* weighed."

Isaiah xxiv, 20, "the earth shall reel *to and fro*."

Jeremiah xxiii, 17, "they say *still*"; 32, "they shall not profit *at all*"; 39, "I will *utterly* forget you"; xxv, 30, "he shall *mightily* roar"; xxxi, 20, "I do *earnestly* remember."

Ezek. i, 3, "the word of the Lord came *expressly*."

Clauses coupled, as they usually are, by the simple conjunction would be bald in English, and therefore a particle supplying a subordinate or logical connection is often employed.

Gen. xv, 2, "what wilt thou give me, *seeing* I go childless."

Exod. v, 18, "no straw given you, *yet* shall ye deliver"; xvii, 2, "give us water *that* we may drink."

Num. iv, 15, "they shall not touch the holy things *lest* they die."

Josh. iii, 13, "when ye see the ark of the covenant. . . . *then* ye shall remove."

Ruth i, 11, "are there yet sons in my womb *that* may be your husbands?" iii, 13, "if he will not do the part of a kinsman, *then* I will."

Prov. xxv, 25, "as cold water . . . *so* is good news."

Similar idioms they also render as happily: Gen. viii, 5, "the waters decreased *continually*"; 7, "which went forth *to and fro*"; xii, 9, "going on *still*"; Jerem. xli, 6, "weeping *all along*"; 2 Sam. iii, 16, "went with her *along* weeping"; v, 10, "David went on and grew *great*"; 1 Chron. xi, 9, "David waxed *greater and greater*." The idiom made by son or daughter or lord they often do not give literally, as sons of sheep, sons of lightning, sons of the bow, lord of a woman, for such literal translation would have seemed as a foreign idiom. The repetition of a noun is well rendered: as two-two by "two and two"; day-day, by "every day"; six wings six wings, by "each one had six wings"; Deut. xxv, 13, "thou shalt not have in thy bag a stone and a stone"—"divers measures"—occurring also in Prov. xx, 23; Psalms xii, 2, "an heart and an heart" is rendered "a double heart." In such cases the literal rendering is put in the margin—"perfect peace," "peace, peace," Isaiah xxvi, 3. The phrase literally "good in the eyes of" is rendered "as it pleaseth," "as it liketh," "what he thought good," "as it seemeth good," "if he think good."

In the New Testament they show similar devices. The verb which is commonly rendered "*seek*" they vary by the translation, "go about to," John vii, 19, 20, Acts xxi, 31, and by "were about to" in xxvii, 30. One particle¹ is rendered as the context suggests, "*and*," or "*but*," or "*now*," or "*so*," or "*moreover*," or "*even*" in Philip. ii, 8, or it is omitted altogether. They also vary another particle,² though not always correctly, "*and*," "*even*," "*also*," "*but*," "*then*," "*so*," "*yet*," "*when*," "*therefore*," "*if*." To have kept the Greek participle uniformly in English would have made the ver-

¹ *δέ*.² *καί*.

sion intolerably heavy—it is therefore often resolved into a finite verb, a resolution which takes place in nearly every verse in the second chapter of Matthew. This method is not so accurate when participle and verb mark a contemporaneous act. We have in Matt. ix, 2, "Jesus seeing their faith said," though it is differently rendered in Luke v, 20, "when he saw their faith." In Matt. xii, 15, the better rendering would be, "but Jesus knowing it withdrew"—the knowledge being that of his own divine omniscience; and similarly in Matt. xvi, 8. Their ordinary method is reversed in Luke xxii, 15, the more literal rendering being kept in the text, "with desire I have desired," and the usual form transferred to the margin, "I have heartily desired"; and similarly Acts vii, 34, "I have seen, I have seen," Jer. xxiii, 25.

Their own style, as seen in their learned and very elaborate preface, was somewhat pedantic and cumbrous, and wanted the lithe and easy turns of an earlier age, but they did not employ it. Not that in their version they altogether

"Against Apollo's lute decreed,
And gave it for Pan's oaten reed."

But the English of their Bible is especially Saxon. Saxon prevails in most of the verses; but Latin occasionally, though rarely, predominates in others, as in Isaiah l, 1,¹ Jer. xxxi, 25,² in Luke vi, 49, as in each of its last three clauses is a Latin term,³ and in 2 Cor. ix, 13, there are five Latin terms.⁴ In the familiar twenty-third psalm five verses have each a non-English word and the fifth verse has no less than five Latin terms. On the other hand "now" occurs three times in Acts xxvii, 9—the first instance might have been easily dispensed with; the pronoun "she" occurs five times in Luke viii, 47; "shall" is used four times in Matt. xiii, 14; and "should" four times

¹ Divorcement, creditors, iniquities, transgressions; usurer—standing for creditor in the Bishops' and the Great Bible

² Satiare, replenish.

³ Vehement, immediately, ruin.

⁴ Experiment, ministration, glory, professed, subjection.

in Matt. xiii, 15; the strange collocation "this, that this" occurs in Matt. xxvi, 13; "that that" is found in Num. vi, 21, Dan. xi, 36, Zech. xi, 9, John xxi, 23, in the two latter places taken from the Bishops.¹ The unusual connection, "when they had this done," meets us in Luke v, 6. The proportion of Saxon to Latin words in it is over ninety per cent, while in Shakespeare it is about eighty-five, in Swift eighty-nine, in Johnson only about seventy-five, and in Gibbon about seventy per cent. The Lord's Prayer as given in St. Matthew consists of sixty-five words exclusive of the transferred Amen. Of these words fifty-nine are Saxon as against six Latin ones. Nay, the first five and thirty words are all Saxon in succession.² But while the preponderance of Saxon terms is so great, they did not scruple to press Latin terms into their service when they were deemed necessary to compactness and strength. They have "succour" as well as "help," "misery" as well as "wretchedness" which occurs only once, "intercession" as well as "pleading" which occurs only twice. They use both "act" and "deed," "similitude" and "likeness," "power" and "might," "justice" and "righteousness," "marriage" and "wedding," "transgression" and "sin," "desert" and "wilderness," "testimony" and "witness," "tabernacle" and "tent," "equity" and "righteousness," "remission" and "forgiveness." In the same way are found "kingly" and "royal," "death" and "mortal," "flesh" and "carnal," "gentile" and "heathen," "charity" and "love," "distil" and "drop," "sanctify" and "hallow," "conceal" and "hide," "timely" and "early," "chief" and "head," "obscurity" and "darkness," "sufficient" and "enough," "labour" and "work,"

¹ In three sentences of the Pilgrim's Progress "but" occurs six times. Milton ridicules Bishop Hall for writing "Teach each."

² Gifford notes, "There was a book much read by our ancestors, from which, as being the pure well-head of English prose, they derived a number of phrases which have sorely puzzled their descendants.

This book, which is fortunately still in existence, is the Bible, and I venture to affirm without fear of contradiction that those old-fashioned people who have studied it well are as competent judges of the meaning of our ancient writers as most of the devourers of black literature from Theobald to Stevens." Gifford's Massinger, p. 58, London, 1853.

"castle" and "hold." They were fastidious, however, in their admission of Latin terms. Many words much in use now and occurring only once in Shakespeare are not found in Scripture at all—as abrupt, ambiguous, artless, improbable, improper, impure, and inconvenient. But by a happy instinct of selection they admitted such terms as "ambassador" and "operation," though Swift objects to them along with "preliminaries," "speculation," &c.; and they have taken "temperance," which Elyot in 1534 regarded as modern, "destruction" though Fulke branded it, "austere" though in 1601 Holland thought it necessary to explain it; and "element," though Shakespeare plays with it as a word "overworn." But they did not admit a word so common now as "character"¹ though it occurs so often in Shakespeare; and they refused "adore," "elevation," "accommodate," the last term being ridiculed by Shakespeare and Ben Jonson; and though they employed the Latin "compassion," they did not take "sympathy," though the word in its Greek form occurred twice in their text, but the term meant sometimes at that period "equality of station." "Learn" does not occur in an active sense, though it is found several times in the Bishops' and the Prayer Book version of the Psalms, and was in common use.² Many terms occur only once, not simply technical words, but such as the following from a foreign source: Abjects, addicted, advisement, advocate, agony, aided, allege, allegory, arouse, amiable, amerce, ancestors, assist, argument, averse, benefactor, benevolence, bravery, bray, brawling, celestial, chapel, chafed, chant, clemency, cogitation, commodious, contribution, comparable, condescend, congratulate, concert, decess (as an intransitive and as a neuter verb), delectable, decently, depend, descry, debase,

¹ Wotton says, "Now here then will lie the whole businesse, to set down beforehand certain Signatures of Hopefulness, or Characters as I will rather call them, because that word hath gotten already some entertainment among us."

² But a more adventurous trans-

later than they has transferred a participle in Matt. ii, 7, and also changed it into a noun, his rendering being, "Enquired exactly of them the time of the phenomenon of the star." Bowes' Translation, Dundee, 1870.

demonstration, discipline, disclose, displayed, disfigure, dispatch, disgrace, enable, endure, empire, endow, ensue, entire, environ, erect, eternity (once in text, three times in margin), exchanger (banker), exercise, as a noun, forfeit, frankly (gratuitously, Luke vii, 42), ignominy, illuminate, imperious, implead, importunity, incredible, infallible, intelligence, laud, magnificent, magnificence, million, modesty, monument, misused, mutual, news, object (verb), oration, pernicious, potentate, protection, pursue, putrifying, quantity, rare, rase, reasonable (rational), recall, recount, redound, reformation, renounced, reliest, resemble (as an active verb), renounce, repeateth, rifled, rites (but twice also in the margin), schism, servitors, senses, severity, strain, temporal, terrestrial, tranquillity, transferred, treatise, unction, vent, vouch, voyage. They ventured on "purtenance" but once, Exodus xii, 9, though the word is found in Tyndale and Coverdale;¹ they admit "expiation" "echo," and "compose" only once into the margin, and the common theological term "type" is also excluded from the text, and found only in the margin. On the other hand many Saxon terms used in Shakespeare and not occurring in Scripture have become obsolete,² and many of his Latin terms not accepted by our translators have passed out of currency. The following words in the Version, mostly native, are found only once: Ado, aloof, badness, bestead, bestir, betake, blaze

¹ The phrase "saddle me the ass" is sometimes supposed to be a common idiom with an expletive word, but "me" is in this case the literal rendering of the pronoun in the Hebrew text "for me."

² Such as "faith'd," "scaling" for weighing, "able" as a verb, "entertain," to take into service, "cheer" face, "brief" letter, "dern" lonely, "yclad," "yclept," "bate," "birthdom." Similarly such Latin words as "sense" for sensual passion, "absolute" for perfect, "fine" for end, "mure" for wall,

"tuition" for defence, "fracted" for broken; "lot," "period," and "monster" as verbs; "testimonied," "concent" for harmony, "affront" to meet with, "acture" for action, &c. In Cockeram's English Dictionarie, or interpreter of hard English words, &c. (London, 1632), it is said that "abate," which occurs four times in the Version, is a word now out of use, and only used of some ancient writers. Neither the Bible nor Milton in his poetry uses a word now so familiar as "commence."

belch (and once in the margin), belief, bide, boisterous, bolled, bloom, border (as a verb), bought (as a noun in the margin), cabins, chapmen, dandled, deemed, flash, forecast, gaddest, gulf, huge, outlived, outran, outlandish, outwent, pate, pathway, pilld, rests (as a noun, margin "rebatement"), right early, right well, road, shapen, swerve, unspoken, untoward, well nigh.¹

Reference was made in the previous course of the narrative to the Latin paper handed in by the English divines to the Synod of Dort, giving an account of the process of revision which had produced a version "so very accurate." The royal rules prescribed² to the revisers are here reduced to seven, and four of these seven are upon matters not alluded to in the original fourteen, while the first, second, and fourth coincide with the first, sixth, and seventh of the earlier canons. Probably those new rules had sprung from the necessities of the work, or had been naturally suggested as the work advanced. These newer regulations, affording daily guidance to the various companies, were fresh in the memory of the delegates: while the others, issued in 1604, containing ultimate laws or principles, had faded somewhat out of view.

The fifth rule of the seven quoted at Dort took up the Apocrypha—"that in the translation of Tobit and Judith, as there was great difference between the Greek and the old Vulgate text, the Greek text should rather be followed."³

Considerable license was taken in revising the Apocrypha, as probably they had no belief in the inspiration of its books. The following words and phrases occurring in it are not found in the canonical portions of Scripture: Abashed, abridge,

¹ The affectation of using fine terms in a version of Scripture is not confined to England, though Lowth and Campbell are occasionally touched by it. About the period of the Nicene Council, a noted preacher in Cyprus, in a quotation from the Gospels, eschewed *κράββατον* and preferred *σκήμπους*, "couch" to "bed." The famous Bishop Spiridion being in the audience, at once cried out to him, "Are you better than he that said 'bed' that you are ashamed to use his words?" Stanley's Eastern Church, p. 108. The incident is also referred to in the translators' preface.

² See pp. 191, 201.

³ Sessio VII.

adore, adherent, aim, amain, anew, annoy, apparition, attempt, augmentation, brickle, baggage, canopy, carrs, clubs, cocker (to pamper), commentaries, conduct (meaning safe conduct), conjecture, counterfeit, culture, defective, defray, distinguish (once in margin, 1 Cor. iv, 7), echo, enforce, enterprise, everlastingness, exquisite, voyage (Jud. ii, 19), fact, falls (as a plural noun), favoureth, feat, fear (to terrify), forlorn, graces, gratify, immunities, incredulity, impiety, indifferent, invincible, jollity, justices, loyal, magi, mitigate, niggard, outroad, penalty, pleasure (as a verb), reconciliation, resolute, shrewd (a "shrewd turn" or clever retaliation), submissively, unright, thrive, timorous, trace, tyrant, tender (to feel tenderness), wearing, uneasy (in the sense of difficult), importable, ugly, and such phrases as "well is him" (Eccles. xxv, 8, 9), "take example at," "get the day," "other some," "he sticks not," "not for our turn," "make him away," "the party," that is, an individual—"the man or the woman," "curious," four times in the sense of "inquisitive," "within the liberties," "took no good order," "sour behaviour," "held them battle," "laugh upon," "shall ripe," "will fat," "pensions—to all who kept the city," "at the last gasp," &c.

The marginal notes in the *Apocrypha* are freer in character than those of the Old Testament. The translators had the Septuagint of Aldus, that in the Complutensian Polyglott, and the Codex Vaticanus printed in Rome 1586. But as the text was not in a satisfactory state, they were obliged to set down no less than 154 various readings. They bracketed as spurious Eccles. i, 7, though the Bishops' had admitted it, and also Eccles. xvii, 5, they marked in a similar way. There are 138 notes for the purpose of giving more literally or precisely the sense of the original Greek or Latin.¹ There are in the margin also 174 variations given of the spelling of proper names, 167 of which belong to 1 Esdras; and there are 505 alternative renderings, with other 42 notes designed to impart information. They depart from their practice in the Old

¹ They had only a Latin text of 2 given by Dr. Scrivener, Cambridge Esdras. The different readings, with Paragraph Bible, Introduction, p. the authorities, are lucidly and fully xxvii, &c.

Testament by quoting authorities, not only Josephus, but Herodotus, Pliny, Athanasius, the Latin interpreter, and Junius the translator. For the text they refer at Tobit xiv, 5, 18, to the "Roman copie"; also 1 Mac. ix, 9, and xii, 37, where it is called the "Roman reading."

Geddes, the Catholic critic, an admirer of Castalio, objects to such biblical Saxon compounds as "therefore," "wherefore," "therein," "wherein"—"wherein" being the only tolerable, decent gentleman of the family"; and Hume, expressing a strong antipathy to the use of *th* as the termination of the third person singular of verbs, also brands "wherewith" as an old-fashioned dangling word, as "having no harmony, no eloquence, no ornament, and not much correctness, whatever the English may imagine," and swears "that he would not swallow it," though Robertson and Swift are so partial to it. But these idiomatic vocables are so useful and expressive that they cannot be dispensed with. These criticisms of the scholar and historian betray their northern origin, for in the self-training of such men (whose dialect in boyhood was Scotch) to write good English, there mingled unconsciously the desire to be more Attic in its use than those whose mother tongue it was.¹

There are also in the English Bible many native monosyllables; nouns, verbs, and particles, which in their common or idiomatic use give directness, clearness, and harmony to the clauses, which are not only comprehended at once, but fix themselves in the memory and linger in the ear like an echo or the refrain of a song.² What is scholastic has no place in it; it uses "great plainness of speech," and so utters itself that all may "mark, learn, and inwardly digest." It is a stranger to "inkhorn terms" and to classical intricacies of construction, for in Hebrew and in New Testament Greek ideas occur in coordinate succession and are not ranged round or subordinated

¹ Yet Hume could write in reference to Cato and Brutus, "the leisure of these noble antients were employed in the study of Grecian eloquence."

² There are five lines and a half in Shakespeare consisting of about 40 words, and of those only five are not monosyllables. Macbeth, vol. VII, p. 15, ed. Dyce.

to one central thought which is gradually evolved. So that a true version preserving the form as well as the spirit of the original could not have been made, in the style of Hooker,¹

“ With many a winding bout
Of linked sweetness long drawn out.”

It was guarded against the euphuism of an earlier period, with its antitheses, alliterations, sounding epithets, and circuitous politeness of diction, “drawing out the thread of verbosity finer than the staple of argument.” Nor was it tainted with such mannerisms as were current some years afterwards, and were beginning to appear in 1611; and the English of Evelyn, Temple, or Jeremy Taylor would have been wholly out of place.

A special theological nomenclature had been provided for the revisers in the previous translations. What was wanted now was the clothing of the divine oracles in the genial and familiar tongue elevated only by its sacred use from that of ordinary life. Some words of a former period that were passing away they preserved, and words only coming in and not fully welcomed they did not admit. The marks of age upon the version are like the hoary locks of the prophet, giving him a reverential grandeur. As in Dryden’s canon, “the court, the college, and the town are all joined” in it. So free is it from

¹ Bacon has “immarcessible,” mon Prayer of the time of Edward VI, and indicate at that early period the two great sources of the language. These still occur: “amplexed,” “precordial.” Hooker has “learnedest,” “virtuousest,” &c., “wiselier,” “easilier,” and “powerable” for “powerful.” Ascham has “inventivest,” and Bacon uses similar forms. Jeremy Taylor has “funest,” “claucularly,” “contrition” in its literal sense as applied to the doom of the serpent. Hooker also couples native and foreign terms — “rectitude” and “straightness,” “coecity” and “blindness,” “sense” and “meaning.” Such collocations are frequent in the Book of Com-

many of those usages that mark or characterize any special literary epoch, that it has amidst all changing fashions maintained itself as a standard for two hundred and sixty years among all peoples using our island speech. For the English Bible is endowed with a wondrous universality of adaptation. To men of intellect and culture its lucid simplicity of style brings relief, and it appears to them like the blue sky overhead, which, while it reveals much, gives a glimpse into much more behind it. It has been recited in academic halls, lordly towers, and royal palaces; and no element of vulgarity has been felt in it, nay, the graceful popularity of its language has been its special charm and fascination. It has been read in barns and miserable outhouses to earnest and untutored rustics, and as it spoke to them in their own tongue, they realized the presence of divinity, and listened to the voice of God. Though its English differed from the more familiar dialect of the olden time on this side of the Tweed, it was carried joyously to moors and glens in Scotland, and listened to as the immediate revelation of the Almighty, by bands of worshippers crowded into some spot under the shadow of a great hill, while the eagle sailed above them, and the music of the waterfall was the accompaniment of their song.

Such in general is the style of the Authorized Version, and it remains a noble specimen of the variety, richness, elasticity, and power of the English language, about which an Elizabethan bard ventured to sing—

“ And who in time knows whither we may vent
The treasures of our tongue? to what strange shores
This gain of our best glory shall be sent
T’ enrich unknowing nations with our stores?
What worlds in th’ yet unform’d occident
May ’come refin’d with accents that are ours?”

The beginning of the seventeenth century was propitious to the execution of such a work. Mulcaster had said, in 1582, “I take this present period of our English tung to be the verie height thereof, because I find it so excellently well fined both for the

bodie and tung itself, and for the customary writing thereof, as either foren workmanship can giue it glosse, or as home-wrought handling can giue it grace." "The English tong cannot prove fairer than it is at this date, if it may please our learned sort so to esteeme it and to bestow their travell upon such a subject."¹ The true dialect, according to Puttenham, is not "in effect any speech used beyond the river of Trent, though no man can deny but that theirs is the purer English Saxon at this day, yet it is not so courtly nor so current as our Southern English is; no more is the far Western man's speech; ye shall therefore take the usual speech of the court, and that of London and the shires lying about London within sixty miles, and not much above. I say not this but in every shire of England there be gentlemen and others that speak, but specially write, as good Southern as we of Middlesex or Surrey do; but not the common people of every shire, to whom the gentlemen and also their learned clerks do for the most part condescend; but herein we are ruled by the English dictionaries and other books written by learned men; and therefore it needeth none other direction in that behalf. Albeit peradventure some small admonition be not impertinent, for we find in our English writers many words and speeches amendable; and ye shall see in some many inkhorn terms so ill affected, brought in by men of learning as preachers and schoolmasters; and many strange terms of other languages, by secretaries and merchants and travellers; and many dark words, and not usual nor well sounding, though they be daily spoken in court. Wherefore great heed must be taken by our maker in this point that his choice be good." . . . "Of this number are 'scientific,' 'conduct'—a French word, but well allowed of us, and long since usual; it sounds something more than this word (leading), for it is applied only to the leading of a captain, and not as a little boy should lead a blind man; 'idiom,' from the Greek; 'significant,' borrowed of the Latin and French, but to us brought in first by some nobleman's secretary, as I think, yet doth so well serve the turn as it could not now be spared;

¹ *Elémentaire*, p. 189, London.

and many more like usurped Latin and French words, as 'method, methodical, placation, function, assubtiling, refining, compendious, prolix, figurative, inveigle'—a term borrowed of our common lawyers; 'impression,' also a new term, but well expressing the matter, and more than our English word; 'penetrate, penetrable, indignity' (in the sense of unworthiness), and a few more."¹

By the middle of the century, in 1662, Swift expresses the opinion that the English language had grown corrupt since the Restoration. Evelyn thought it necessary to explain such technical terms in his *Sylva*, 1664, as homogeneous, mural, perennial, vernal; and others which he did not condescend to explain as being "obvious" are lapidescent, insititious, politure, stramental, procerity, improsperity, surbated, subductitious, &c.² But Fuller, a native of Northamptonshire, mentions that the language of the common people³ in that county is generally the best of any shire in England. When he was a boy he had been told by a "hand labouring man" "that the last translation of the Bible done by those learned men in the best English agreeth perfectly with the common speech of our country."

¹ *Art of Poesy*, bk. iii, 1589.

ness, vacuous, salacious, ministrations of faculty, &c.

² The following words appear in a recent volume of *Transatlantic Sermons*: Acerb, avertness, basilar, eifulges, sapid, resurrected, inward-

³ *Worthies of England*, vol. II, p. 496, London, 1840.

The motto at the beginning of the section is from the pen of the late F. W. Faber, and is taken from his "Essay on the Interest and Characteristics of the Lives of the Saints." London, 1853.

CHAPTER XLV.

BUT in the course of two centuries and a half some words have become obsolete, some have changed their signification, and the meaning of others has grown obscure and unfamiliar. It is, at the same time, a remarkable peculiarity that many terms have kept their place because they occur in the text of the Bible, and that others have fallen out of use because they are found only in the margin or in the contents prefixed to each chapter. The third of the Rules delivered by the English divines to the Synod of Dort is, "that when a Hebrew or Greek word admits of two proper senses, one should be expressed in the text and the other in the margin."¹ The following list indicates an attempt to present in the margin a literal rendering of the original, and those marginal renderings are for the most part not now in currency:—

Margin.	Text.	
Whetter.	Instructor.	Gen. iv, 22.
Ascending of the morning.	Breaking of the day.	Gen. xxxii, 24.
Eunuch.	Officer.	Gen. xxxvii, 36.
Chief of the slaughtermen.	Captain of the guard.	Gen. xxxvii, 36.
Tentation.	Massah.	Exodus xvii, 7.
Surplusage.	That which remaineth.	Exodus xxvi, 13.
Twinned.	Coupled.	Exodus xxvi, 24.
On a slice.	In a pan.	Levit. ii, 5.
Faulty to die.	Guilty of death.	Num. xxxv, 31.
Thou shalt not bough it.	Thou shalt not go over the boughs again.	Deut. xxiv, 20.
Dungy gods.	Idols.	Deut. xxix, 17.

¹ See p. 201.

Margin.	Text.	
Doth his easement.	Covereth his feet.	Judges iii, 24.
Till the day declined.	Till the afternoon.	Judges xix, 8.
The pitching time of day.	The day groweth to an end.	Judges xix, 9.
And he circuited.	Went in circuit.	1 Sam. vii, 16.
Forbear ns.	Give us respite.	1 Sam. xi, 3.
Battle array.	The fight.	1 Sam. xvii, 20.
Bought of a sling.	The middle of a sling.	1 Sam. xxv, 29.
Hath a pursuit.	He is pursuing.	1 Kings, xviii, 27.
Minister.	Servant.	2 Kings vi, 15.
To rafter.	To floor.	2 Chron. xxxiv, 11.
The eyelids of the morning.	The dawning of the day.	Job iii, 9.
Dredge.	Corn.	Job xxiv, 6.
Chanelbone (collar bone.)	The bone.	Job xxxi, 22.
Fallings.	Flakes.	Job xli, 23.
Gladdened him.	Made him glad.	Ps. xxi, 6.
Roll thy way.	Commit thy way.	Ps. xxxvii, 5.
Wearied.	Troubled.	Ps. xxxviii, 6.
For the rulings.	To rule.	Ps. cxxxvi, 8.
Changers.	Them that are given to change.	Prov. xxiv, 21.
Iterateth.	Returneth to.	Prov. xxvi, 11.
Righten.	Relieve.	Isaiah i, 17.
Sweet balls.	Chains.	Isaiah iii, 19.
Spangled ornaments.	Mufflers.	Isaiah iii, 19.
Exactress of gold.	Golden city.	Isaiah xiv, 4.
Wringer.	Extortioner.	Isaiah xvi, 4.
From the thrum.	With pining sickness.	Isaiah xxxviii, 12.
Through-aired.	Large (chambers.)	Jerem. xxii, 14.
Convent (as a verb.)	Appoint.	Jerem. xlix, 19.
Flit gretly.	Get you far off.	Jerem. xlix, 30.
Strakes.	Rings.	Ezek. i, 18.
Endirons.	Hooks.	Ezek. xl, 43.
Concision or threshing.	Decision.	Joel iii, 14.
Palmcrist.	Gourd.	Jonah iv, 6.
Gallants.	Worthies.	Nahum ii, 5.
Covering or coverer.	Defence.	Nahum ii, 5.
Flue net.	Drag.	Hab. i, 15.
With one shoulder.	With one consent.	Zeph. iii, 9.
Him that waketh and him that answereth.	Master and scholar.	Mal. ii, 12.
Observation.	Ordinance.	Mal. iii, 14.
Away.	Let us alone.	Luke iv, 34.
Persuasible.	Enticing.	1 Cor. ii, 4.

Margin.	Text.	
Gallings one of another.	Perverse disputings.	1 Tim. vi, 5.
Makebates.	False accusers.	2 Tim. iii, 3.
Profess honest trades.	Maintain good works.	Titus iii, 14.
Taketh not hold of.	Took not on him the nature.	Heb. ii, 16.
Interposed himself.	Confirmed it.	Heb. vi, 17.
Way to change his mind.	Place of repentance.	Heb. xii, 17.
Add it to the prayers.	Offer it with the prayers.	Rev. viii, 3.

There are also in the margin not a few plural terms, which have not come into use at all, but were chosen on purpose to represent literally some plurals in the original. Holinesses, Exodus xl, 10; greatnesses, 1 Chron. xvii, 19; equities, Prov. i, 3; secrecies, Prov. ix, 17; frowardnesses, Prov. x, 32; righteousnesses, Isaiah xxxiii, 15; uprightnesses, Isaiah xxxiii, 15; prosperities, Jerem. xxii, 21; bitternesses, Lam. iii, 15; vengeancees, Ezek. xxv, 17.

Where the translation has a slight paraphrase the margin renders the Hebrew occasionally by terms which have slipped out of view. "Escaper," 2 Kings ix, 15; "praisers," 2 Chron. xx, 21; "raiser," Hosea vii, 4; "rangers," 1 Chron. xii, 33.

In their own preface the revisers use words and phrases which they did not venture to put into the translation.

In the contents prefixed to the chapters are not a few words and phrases which have wholly or nearly passed away. In the choice of them the revisers were not in any way influenced by a desire to give the exact equivalent of the original, as is done so often in the margin, but they employed familiar phraseology. Many of the terms and phrases which they employed have not survived, but others are specimens of old and pithy English. Gen. xxx, "Laban stayeth him"; xvii, "Abraham his name is changed"; xix, "the incestuous original of Moab"; xxiv, "Abraham sweareth his servant"; xxix, "taketh acquaintance"; xliii, "Jacob is hardly persuaded to send Benjamin"; l, "Joseph dieth and is chested" (a word common still in the rural parts of Scotland). Levit. xxvi, "religiousness." Deut. vii, "assuredness." Josh. ii, "the spies, their return and relation" (that is report); x, "the five

kings are mured in a cave." 1 Sam. iii, "groweth in credit"; xiv, "unwitting to his father"; xxx, "by means of a revived Egyptian he is brought to the enemies." 2 Sam. ix, "he maketh Ziba his farmer." 1 Kings i, "Adonijah, David's darling usurpeth"; xii, "a suit of relaxation." 2 Kings xvi, "diverteth the brazen altar to his own devotion." 2 Chron. xxviii, "Judah being captivated by the Israelites." Esther v, "Haman builded a pair of gallows." Job i, "by calumnyation"; v, "inconsideration"; xxxii, "reproveth them for not satisfying of Job"; xxxviii, "God . . . convinceth Job of imbecility"; Psalms iv, "David prayeth for audience"; v, "professeth his study in prayer"; xxxix, "impatency"; lxxxvi, "by the conscience of his religion"; cxlvii, "power over the meteors." Pro. viii, "evidency"; vii, "a young wanton." Isaiah iii, "impudency"; ix, "impenitency"; xiv, "insultation over Babel"; xviii, "an access thereby shall grow"; xxviii, "God's discreet providence"; xlv, "convinceth the idols of vanity"; liii, "excuseth the scandal of the cross." Jerem. xxxvi, "they will Baruch to hide himself"; xxxix, "the city ruinated, the people captivated"; xlix, "the restoration of Elam." Mal. i, "irreligiousness." Matt. i, "the misdeeming thoughts of Joseph"; xi, "unrepentance"; xxii, "Christ poseth the Pharisees"; Mark x, "resolveth a rich man how he may inherit eternal life"; xii, "resolveth the scribe who questioned the first commandment." Luke ii, "questioneth with the doctors"; v, likeneth faint hearted and weak disciples to "old bottles and worn garments"; xxii, "dehorteth." John xix, "being overcome with the outrage of the Jews." Acts xv, "Paul and Barnabas fall at strife"; vi, "appoint the office of deaconship to seven men"; xxvii, "Paul shipping toward Rome." Rom. v, "sith we were reconciled," but also in the text of Ezek. xxxv, 6; xliii "works of darkness are out of season in the time of the gospel." 1 Cor. xiii, "prelation of charity before faith and hope"; xiv, "the abuse taxed"; xvi, "shutteth up his epistle." 2 Cor. x, "who disgraced the weakness of his person" (spoke in ridicule and contempt of it); x, "against all adversary powers." 2 Tim. iv, "willeth him to come

speedily unto him." Titus iii, "directed by Paul concerning . . . he is willed also to reject obstinate heretics." James v, "we ought . . . to reduce a straying brother to the truth." Heb. iii, "more worthy punishment"; x, "the law sacrifices." 1 Peter i, "salvation in Christ no news" (novelty). 2 Peter i, "whereof he is careful to remember them." 1 John ii, "He comforteth them against the sins of infirmity"; iv, "we are to try the spirits by the rule of the Catholick faith."

There are also some obsolete terms in the text of the Authorized Version; some words gone wholly out of use, or that are rarely employed, and others that now carry a different signification. The following have almost or wholly ceased to be in use:—Tabret, artillery in the sense of an archer's weapons, dulcimer, sackbut, scrip, knops, ouches, bosses, taches, leasing, pate, shine, earing—ploughing, brigandine, hard to for hard by, with—a twig or chord, emerods, scrabbled, habergeon, swaddle, wench, wimple, sherd as a simple term, "breaches" for "creeks," "fat" for "vat," "charger" in the sense of a "capacious dish,"¹ "chambering" for "lechery," "coasts" for "borders," "room" for "place," "hardness" for "hardship," "dure" for "endure," "defenced" for "fenced," "entreat" for "treat," "minish" for "diminish," "camp" for "encamp," "endamage" for "damage," "gazing-stock," "taken with the manner," in the act, a law phrase which occurs also in Shakespeare, Num. v, 13; "ray" for "array," "ware" for "aware," "tire" as an article of female headdress, so that "attired" is properly used of Aaron wearing his mitre, Leviticus xvi, 4; "changeable suits" in the sense of festal garments, changed or put off when the festival is over; "estate" meaning "state" or "company," Acts xxii, 5; "estates" meaning "persons high in authority," Mark vi, 21,² "resemble" as an active verb,

¹ But Macaulay uses it—"Many of these (the royalist party) mortgaged their laud, pawned their jewels, and broke up their silver chargers and christening bowls." History of England, vol. I, p. 113.

² Barclay, "Ship of Fools," says that his language was "for rude people much more convenient than for estates, learned men, or eloquent."

Luke xiii, 18; "white" in an active sense, Mark ix, 3; "equal" as an active verb, Lam. ii, 13; "convert" as a transitive verb, used only once of a human agent, James v, 19, 20, and once of the Divine law, Ps. xix, and once in an intransitive sense, Isaiah vi, 10; "ragged" in the sense of "rugged," Isai. ii, 21; "strike" his hand, to move over or up and down, 2 Kings v, 11; "book," libellus, a formal accusation, Job xxxi, 35; "ambassage" as so spelt; "the concision," a satirical term for the circumcision, Phil. iii, 2; "delicates," Jer. xli, 34; "thoroughly," Ps. li, 2; "translate" in the sense of transfer, 2 Sam. iii, 10; "he thought scorn," Esther iii, 6; "vial," a goblet; "draught," a sink; "let," to hinder, Isaiah xliii, 13, 2 Thes. ii, 7; "worse liking," Dan. i, 10; "all to" in the sense of thoroughly, "all to brake his skull," Judges ix, 53 (a common idiom in the older writers, occurring also in Milton's Comus); "listed," Matt. xvii, 12; "lively," living, 1 Peter ii, 5; "undersetters," props, 1 Kings vii, 30; "going forth" as a noun meaning outlet, Ezek. xlv, 5; "Jehoram departed without being desired," or regretted, 2 Chron. xxi, 20—"swelling," 2 Cor. xii, 20, used in an ethical sense; "matter," material or fuel, James iii, 5; "noisome," not disgusting, but, according to its origin, noxious, Ps. xci, 3; "injurious," insolent, 1 Tim. i, 13; "discover" would now be uncover, Ps. xxix, 9; "either" is two considered separately;—"on either side of the river" (Rev. xxii, 2),¹ means, according to old use, on the one and on the other side. The usage is common; it was no slip, and no novelty, as it is found in Lev. x, 1; John xix, 18; "each" would now be not more correct, but only more intelligible English; Exodus ix, 31, "bolled," podded, perhaps allied to bell, as holpen to help; "blains" yet survives in chil-blains. "Matrix," in the low Latin sense of womb, is not in currency; nor "cleave to" in the sense of adhere, Acts xi, 23; nor "tablet" meaning beads or amulets, Exodus xxxv, 22; nor "botch" with the sense of boil; nor "burst" with that of break; nor "base" with that of mean in appearance; nor

¹ Tennyson has—

"On either side the river lie
Long fields of barley and of rye."

"bunch" with that of hump (Isaiah xxx, 6), in reference to a camel. "For to," "but and if," "sirs," "handiwork," "afore," "silverling," "shroud" (Ezek. xxxi, 3), shadow produced by the thick foliage, "comely" with a spiritual reference (Ps. xxxiii, 1), "lightly" in the sense of speedily or soon (Mark ix, 39), "be at a stay," (Levit. xiii, 5) "lewd" as meaning lay or unlearned, are not in present employment. "Worship" has now the thinner meaning of honour—"thou shalt have worship," Luke xiv, 10, as in Wycliffe, "worsehiþe thi fader and thi moder," Mark vii, 10; or John xii, 26, "if any man serve me my fader shall worship him."

Some words and phrases, though unusual now, are easily understood; are, in short, innocent archaisms, and give an antique tinge to the version. "Woe worth the day," Ezek. xxx, 2, "worth" connected with the German *werden*; "bravery" is gay clothing in Isaiah iii, 18, in common Scotch "braws"; "by and bye" is not a time at some little distance, but immediately, Mark vi, 25, Luke xxi, 9; "road" which occurs only once, does not signify a path, but an inroad, a raid, 1 Sam. xxvii, 10; "seared" is scorched, or cauterized, 1 Tim. iv, 7; "ranges for pots," Levit. xi, 35; but "ranges" is ranks of soldiers, 2 Kings xi, 8, 15, at least the Hebrew word has this meaning; "ranges" appears in the Great Bible in verse 8, but in verse 17 the words are, "without the temple, that she may be within the ranges,"—after Münster—Coverdale having "wall," and the Rheims "precincts of the temple,"—Vulgate, *septum*—the English term "ranges" might mean in that case the limits or boundaries of the temple. The noun is left untranslated in the Septuagint. Shamefastness (1 Tim. ii, 9) has been corrupted into the poor and misleading form "shamefacedness." The phrases "set the people a-work" (2 Chron. ii, 18), "having in a readiness" (2 Cor. x, 6) remain unaltered. "Rising" is a swelling, Lev. xiii, 2, 19; "wealth" is not money, but well-being, 1 Cor. x, 24; "let all Israel be generally gathered unto thee" means universally brought together, 2 Sam. xvii, 11; "purchase" is simply to acquire, 1 Tim. iii, 13; "power" is an armed force, "all his power with him," 2 Chron. xxxii, 9; "men of war," Luke xxiii, 11, is a phrase applied now to ships

only; "to break up a house" is now to dismantle it, so that "he would not suffer his house to be broken up," means he would not suffer his house to be broken into (Matt. xxiv, 43), the thief digging through the frail clay walls; "a great altar to see to," Josh. xxii, 10; "how shall we order the child?" (arrange concerning him), Judg. iii, 12—margin, "what shall be the manner of the child?" "Summer and winter" are used as verbs, Isaiah xviii, 6; "ensue" has the sense of "pursue," 1 Pet. iii, 3, 11; "wasteness," Zeph. i, 15; and "ravin," Gen. xlix, 27, are now unfamiliar, as are also the following terms and phrases: "go to," Gen. xi, 3, James iv, 13; "bar and all," Judges xvi, 3; "on a smoke," Exodus xix, 18; "high day," Gen. xxix, 7; "clean escaped," 2 Pet. ii, 18; "cast the same in his teeth," Matt. xxvii, 44; "withal," besides, or over and above, Ps. cxli, 10; Acts xxv, 27, "made as though he would have gone further," Luke xxiv, 28; "fell on sleep," "goodman of the house," Matt. xx, 11; "savour" as a verb, Matt. xvi, 23; "I do you to wit," "wist not," "every whit," "not a whit," "at quiet," "a fishing," "a preparing," "an hungered," "a thirst," "a work," "spring of the day," "much set by," "as good as," "that time is," "for all there were so many," > "at a venture,"—Heb. in his simplicity, not taking aim at any particular mark—"the more part," "many a time," "forth of," "before time," "cast clouts," Jer. xxvii, 11; "of a truth," "any while," "this ado," "at their wits end," "make for," "to the end that," "as touching," "as concerning," "in respect of," "in seething," "in building," "was budded," "was befallen," "at the length," "at the least," "at the last," "follow after," "on examination had," "that thine is," "the quick and the dead," "now a days," "I trow not," "such like," "of a child," "strike hands," "on a day," "it liketh him best," "what time," "when as," "let it forth," "the goings out of it," Num. xxxiv, 5; "thy coming in," Ps. cxxi, 8; "against," by the time that,¹ John xii, 7; 2 Kings xvi, 11; or "to meet one," 1 Sam. ix, 14. There are such combinations as "horse heeles," Gen. xlix, 17; "horse hoofs," Judges v, 22; "horse bridles," Rev. xiv, 20; the

¹ Maetzner's English Grammar, English Trans., vol. III, p. 435, London, 1874.

first of the two nouns being in the possessive. The phrase "three mighties" occurs twice in 1 Chron. xi, 12, 24, the Bishops' and the Great Bible having the "three mightiest" after Tyndale—Matthew, the Genevan and Coverdale in one of the instances have "three worthies."

Some words have only their Latin meaning—a meaning that has passed away, and some preserve two significations. Thus in Acts xxiv, 2, "providence" is forethought, not divine government; "prevent" is used in its original meaning—to go before, to anticipate—in Psalm xxi, 3; cxix, 148; Matt. xvii, 25; 1 Thess. iv, 15, the more modern sense being "to hinder," > to go before, so as to obstruct one. John i, 15, "is preferred before me" means has come to be before me, his office rising in dignity far above mine; but the word is ambiguous, as it is used to signify "to regard one more than another"; and this clause is adduced by Dr. Johnson, in his Dictionary, as an example of such a signification; and the erroneous sense would then be, "elevated in popular opinion above me." "Revive" is brought to life again, 1 Kings xvii, 22; Rom. xiv, 9; "decision," Joel iii, 14, is cutting off; "apprehend," is to seize, Philip. iii, 12; "instant" as an adjective has the meaning of continuous earnestness, Rom. xii, 12; 2 Tim. iv, 2; and the adverb has a similar meaning in Acts xxvi, 7, and in Luke vii, 4; but the noun has a temporal meaning in Luke ii, 38, and as often as it occurs in the Old Testament. "Honest" is honourable, Philip. iv, 8; "eminent" is projecting or prominent, Ezek. xvii, 22; "profited" is made progress, Gal. i, 14; "evidently" is visibly, Acts x, 3. "Conversation," in all places where it occurs, with one exception, keeps its Latin signification, and means, though it represents two Greek words, not talk, but the general tenor of a man's life—his walk; so that it is tautology to speak of "walk and conversation," Gal. i, 13; Eph. iv, 22; Philip. i, 27; 1 Pet. i, 15; but in Philip. iii, 20 it means citizenship, or country, representing a very different Greek substantive. Similarly we have "conversant," Josh. viii, 35—"the strangers that were conversant among them," that is, walked in and out among them, or had familiar daily intercourse; and so in 1 Sam. xxv, 15, and also in the contents of

Acts ii, "devoutly and charitably converse together." "Presumptuously" also keeps a sense, according to its composition in Exod. xxi, 14, "if a man come presumptuously upon his neighbour"—beforehand, and on set purpose, though the Hebrew means cunningly. In other places the word has in it an ethical element of audacity and wilfulness—Num. xv, 30; Deut. i, 43, and in many other places—representing other Hebrew terms. "Replenish," however, is to fill, not to fill again. "Malice" is often vice, or wickedness. "Approve" has sometimes the simple sense of prove, Acts ii, 22; "affect" is to pay court to, Gal. iv, 17; "communicate" is to give to others a share of what we have, Philip. iv, 15; 1 Tim. vi, 18; Heb. xiii, 16, but in other places it has its more common modern meaning of words uttered, as in Matt. v, 37; Eph. iv, 29. To "accept" a person is to show unjust partiality for him, Job xxxii, 21; Gal. ii, 6; but in many instances it has the common modern meaning. "Evil occurrent" is evil coming against, 1 Kings v, 4; "to occupy" is often not to possess, but to trade, Ezek. xxvii, 9, 16, 19, 21, 22, 27; "allege" is to prove, and not, as now, to declare, Acts xvii, 3; "apparent" is manifest, and not seeming; God says of His special revelations to Moses, "With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently"—the contrast being "and not in dark speeches," Num. xii, 8; "charity" is love, 1 Cor. xiii; "comfort," as its origin implies, is not simply consolation, but strength, 2 Cor. xiii, 11. "Fervent" is not ethical, but physical in 2 Pet. iii, 10, 12; "vagabond" is only wanderer, Gen. iv, 12; "to possess" is to seize on, Num. xiii, 30; "comprehend" is used in its original or Latin sense, Isaiah xl, 12; "vain" is empty, or worthless, Judg. ix, 4; "vile" is cheap, insignificant, without any moral implication, in Philip. iii, 21; "volume" is roll; "title" (titulus) is the tablet affixed to the cross, John xix, 19; "temperance" is self-restraint, and not confined to the use of wine, Acts xxiv, 25, &c.; "traditions" are doctrines taught or handed over, either orally or in writing—"by word or our epistle," 2 Thess. ii, 15; "decline" is to turn away, Exod. xxiii, 2; "dissolving doubts" is solving or resolving them, Dan. v, 12; "expecting" is looking out for,

Heb. x, 13; "fame" is report, Matt. xiv, 1; "degree" is step, 2 Kings xx, 9; "provoke" is to call forth, to stir up, but not to anger, 2 Cor. ix, 2; "disposition" is arrangement with no reference to temperament, Acts vii, 53; "damnation" is simply judgment and not eternal penalty, the word having grown into a darker meaning since 1611, 1 Cor. xi, 29. "Incontinent" has a wider reference than to sexual lusts, 2 Tim. iii, 3; "discipline" has its first meaning of instruction, Job xxxvi, 10; so has "describe" in Josh. xviii, 4, 6; "curious" is wrought with care, Exodus xxviii, 8—"the curious girdle of the ephod"—but in Acts xix, 19, it refers to magic. "Creature" is any created thing without the modern notion of a living or organized thing, 1 Tim. iv, 4; "advisement" is deliberation, 1 Chron. xii, 19; "declare" is to make clear, Matt. xiii, 36; "offend" is to be, or prove a cause of stumbling, Matt. xviii, 6, 8, 9; "publican"—a Latin term transferred—is a collector of public revenue, and he was usually in Italy taken from the equestrian order. "Peculiar people" is a people His own special possession, Titus ii, 14; "singular" in Levit. xxvii, 2, is in special or individual connection with oneself; "passion" is suffering, Acts i, 3; "ye bear witness that ye allow the deeds of your fathers," Luke xi, 48 ("allow," "allouer," "allaudare,") the verb meaning not to permit merely, but to approve—similarly, though the original word is different, in Rom. vii, 15, in Rom. xiv, 22, and in 1 Thess. ii, 4, but it represents a different Greek verb in Acts xxiv, 15, and "allowance" with another derivation ("allouer," "allocare,") signifies portion or ration in 2 Kings xxv, 30. "Affinity" in 1 Kings iii, 1, 2 Chron. xviii, 1, Ezra ix, 14, has its strict Latin sense—
 > "affinitas" opposed to "cognatio"—relation by marriage as opposed to relation by blood; "mortify" is to put to death, Rom. viii, 13; "tempt" is to put to trial; "usury" is only interest, not excessive interest in Matt. xxv, 27; "proper" is one's own, 1 Chron. xxix, 3; Acts i, 19; 1 Cor. vii, 7; but it also means fair or comely, Heb. xi, 23—Moses "was a proper child": had the best properties befitting a child. "Very" is "true" in Gen. xxvii, 21, John vii, 26; "attendance" is mental application, attention—a word which, however, does not occur at all, 1 Tim. iv, 13; "nephews" (Lat. *nepos*) are grand-children

according to old usage in 2 Tim. v, 4, and it represents the Hebrew phrase "sons' sons" in Judges xii, 14, Job xviii, 19, Isaiah xiv, 22; and "niece" is used in Wycliffe's version for grand-daughter. "Novice" is one newly admitted to the church, 1 Tim. iii, 6; "virtue" is healing power, Mark v, 30; "piety," 1 Tim. v, 4, is filial affection; "pommel," 2 Chron. iv, 12 (Lat. *pomum*), is a round apple-like ornament; "chapter" is the head of the column, Exodus xxxvi, 38; "shalt discontinue from thine heritage," is shalt be exiled, Jerem. xvii, 4; "several" is separate in Num. xxviii, 13, and 2 Kings xv, 5, "dwelt in a several house." "Taverns" are stalls or shops, the "Tres Tabernæ" in Acts xxviii, 15 being a station on the Appian Road, about ten miles nearer Rome than the Appii Forum.

There occur also such phrases as "even to the mercy seatward," Exodus xxxvii, 9; "he is forehead bald," Levit. xiii, 41, baldness of brow distinguished from baldness of head; "was sufficed," Ruth ii, 14, 18—the active being used as in modern idiom in Num. xi, 22; Ezek. xlv, 6; "how the matter will fall," fall out or happen, Ruth iii, 18; "David avoided out of his presence," slipped softly and suddenly away, 1 Sam. xviii, 11; "three days ago and fell sick," the word "ago" occurring only here, and itself a past participle; "have out," thrust out, 2 Sam. xiii, 9; and so in 2 Kings xi, 15; 2 Chron. xxxv, 23; "me thinketh," 2 Sam. xviii, 27; "methought" occurs in Milton, an impersonal verb, with "me" as a species of dative. "Which" is used both with persons and things, according to old usage. "Which" is the old form; "that," however, being the oldest, as the Anglo-Saxon neuter singular relative, but coming not so near the antecedent as "who" or "which." According to one rule of distinction, (which has many exceptions,) "who" belongs to clauses of additional predication, while "that" is used in restrictive or explanatory clauses.¹ "Which," more definite than "that," is often applied to a person in Shakespeare and his contemporaries; but Shakespeare also couples "who" with animals (a lion who) and inanimate objects (the winds "who take"). Ben Jonson speaks of "our relative which," as if it

¹ The term helpmeet as one word is "help/meet for him"; and the pro-
 wrong; the words in Scripture are an per word would be helpmate

were the only one; and we still say, interrogatively, "which of us"?¹ We have in 1 Kings v, 6, "any that can skill to hew timber," the verb being obsolete, but the noun preserved; 2 Chron. ii, 9, "wonderful great"; Nehemiah xiii, 26, "outlandish women," foreigners; Job xix, 19, "all my inward friends," intimate or confidential; in Hebrew, "men of my secret"; Dan. xi, 30, "have intelligence with" is an understanding with; Prov. xxix, 13, "the Lord lighteneth both their eyes," the eyes of both classes of persons; and Eccles. iv, 3, "better is he than both they." "Away with" has two senses—Isai. i, 13, I cannot away with, cannot get on with, or cannot endure; but John xix, 15, "away with him," off with him to execution; Isai. xv, 5, "with weeping shall they go it up," an old and familiar idiom; Prov. xxi, 20, "spend it up"; Ezek. xxvii, 13, "traded the persons of men"; Hab. ii, 10, "thou hast consulted shame to thy house"; Acts xxiii, 15, "or ever he come," before he come; Amos vii, 17, "into captivity forth of his land"; Matt. vi, 34, "take no thought," thought² in its old meaning of anxiety; Matt. ix, 9, "receipt of custom," the place where custom or toll was received, as in the margin of Mark ii, 14, literally, tollbooth; Matt. xx, 31, "rebuked them because they should hold their peace," that is for the cause, or in order that

¹ Professor Bain, in his Companion to the Higher English Grammar, quotes Professor Milligan of Aberdeen, to the following effect:—"Our translation of St. Matthew's gospel has been examined, for the usage of the several relatives, by Professor Milligan, of Aberdeen, one of the Committee for revising the English Translation of the New Testament. There are 224 relative constructions. Of these, 175 are in strict accordance with the distinctive uses of 'who,' 'which,' and 'that,' as here taught. In 43 cases 'who' or 'which' is put for 'that'; in 6 cases 'that' is put for 'who' or 'which.'"

² Thus, "Hawis was put in trouble and died with thought," Bacon; Wright's Bible Word Book, p. 483. "Queen Catherine Parr died rather of thought," Somers' Tracts; Archbishop Trench's Select Glossary, *sub voce*. In strange ignorance of this old and familiar sense of the term, Mr. Greg, Creed of Christendom, vol. I, p. lxvii, 2nd edition, founds an argument against the morality of the Gospel, as if Christ "not only deprecated, but also denounced and prohibited" all forethought in worldly matters, and encouraged "improvidence." The Greek term denotes cares, dividing or distracting the mind—anxious trouble.

they should hold their peace,¹ as in all the earlier versions but the Rheims. Matt. xxvi, 66, "guilty of death," guilty, in modern English, being connected with the crime, not with the penalty, as in Num. xxxv, 27, "shall not be guilty of blood or of murder"; "likewise" is likewise, or in like manner, and not simply "also," "he also himself likewise," Heb. ii, 14, used similarly by Chaucer and Shakespeare; John iii, 33, "set to his seal"; Acts xxviii, 13, "fetched a compass," tacking on account of the adverse wind; Rom. xvi, 19, "simple" does not mean foolish; James v, 11, "pitiful" is full of pity, not what excites pity; Philip. iv, 6, "careful" is full of care or anxiety; "faithful" is often full of faith, or believing, Eph. i, 1; "painful" is laborious, Ps. lxxiii, 16; "reward" is often to requite, either in a good or bad sense; "rehearse" is to tell, not necessarily to repeat; "cunning" is skilled or expert, Gen. xxv, 27; "fret" is used in a physical sense, Lev. xiii, 55; "passage," 1 Sam. xiii, 23, would now be "pass"; and "witty" has no element of humour in it, Prov. viii, 12.

The language was not matured in the early part of the reign of James, and as it was in a state of oscillation the translators use both forms of the preterite "clad" and "clothed," "shone" and "shined," "awoke" and "awaked," and they have both "stale" and "stole," "lien" and "lain," "strike" and "strake," but never "struck," nor "spoke," nor "broke." They use both "got" and "gotten," "girt" and "girded," in the same chapter, and "built" and "builded" in consecutive verses, nay "leapt" in the text and "leaped" in the margin of 1 Kings xviii, 26; "spilt" and "spilled," "wrung" and "wringed," "clave" and "cleaved," "helped" and "holpen," "held" and "holden"; "sod" but not "seethed"; "digged" only, refusing "dug." The preterite forms of "sew" from "sow," "mew" from "mow," had already passed out of use. "Rent" is used several times as a verb in the present and is once found in modern copies, Jerem. iv, 30. Similar variations occur in smaller matters, as the use of "a" and "an," as "a hand" and "an hand," "a hairy" and "an hairy," "a hole" and "an hole," "a horse" and "an horse," "my" and "mine," "thy" and "thine,"

¹ See page 107.

even in the same verse (Num. v, 20; Job xv, 12), "before" and "before that," "after" and "after that," "hence" and "from hence," "thence" and "from thence." But the version shows general correctness in the use of "shall" and "will," "lye" and "lay," "sit" and "set," "bade" and "bidden"—forms and idioms so often confounded in colloquial English. It has four times "beeves" the regular plural of beef, instead of the more common terms "bullocks" or "oxen." "Sith" occurs once as a logical term in Ezek. xxxv, 6, and "since" is also employed as an *illative* in Joshua ii, 12, and in 1 Cor. xv, 21, but it is oftenest used with a temporal signification. "Beside" usually keeps its original meaning "by the side," as in 1 Sam. xix, 3; Ps. xxiii, 2; but it is also found in the sense of more or in addition to, and it has this modern meaning four times, in Levit. xxiii, 38, Deut. xxix, 1, Luke xvi, 26, and xxiv, 21. On the other hand "besides," while it has its usual sense, is employed once at least in the more literal meaning of "beside," Levit. vi, 10, "he shall put them *besides* the altar," changed, however, in later editions. "Sake" or "sakes" after the preposition "for" is very often employed—considerably over a hundred times—and is preceded by a noun or a pronoun, the form "for the sake of" being ignored.

Many of the older idioms have become obsolete or the meaning has been altered. "*Asa his* heart was perfect," 1 Kings xv, 14; the noun and the pronoun so placed occur in the first edition and in the early editions as far down at least as a Scottish one of 1766—the form now being *Asa's*. Many seem to have thought that the 's is a contraction of the omitted pronoun, whereas it is simply the old Saxon genitive. "*Mordecai his* matters" has been changed into "*Mordecai's* matters" (Esther iii, 4), and the words in the heading of Ruth iii are also modernized, "By Naomi her instructions, Ruth lieth at Boaz *his* feete." "This monstrous syntax," as Ben Jonson calls it, suggested the word "his" as the explanation: man's=man-his; but what then of yours, theirs, ours, hers? "The queen's English" could not be "the queen *his* English." The pronoun "it" in a possessive sense occurs in Shakespeare fifteen times (first folio), and "its" ten times; "its," found only three times in Milton's

poetry, is not found in the Authorized Version at all; the simple "it" is used once, "that which groweth of *it* own accord," Levit. xxv, 5, "*his*" being employed, as it stood in Anglo-Saxon for both masculine and neuter. But the usage sounds strange to modern ears: Gen. i, 11, "after *his* kind whose seed is in itself"; Levit. i, 6, "cut it into *his* pieces"; 15, "the priest shall bring it to the altar and wring off *his* head"; 2 Sam. vi, 17, "they brought in the ark and set it in *his* place"; Ezek. xvii, 9, "it shall wither in all the leaves of *her* spring"; 1 Cor. xiii, 5, "doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not *her* own." Dryden finds fault with Ben Jonson's use of "his" for "its." But at length objects of which sex could not be predicated necessitated the introduction of "its."¹ Chatterton's "Rowley's Poems" might have been pronounced a forgery at once from the occurrence of "its" in such a phrase as "life and all its goods." Dr. Masson has brought the same usage to bear on the genuineness of a little poem found in the British Museum and printed in 1868 in the Times newspaper. In its fifty-four lines "its" occurs four times. At an earlier period, the genitive "is" was common. Palsgrave² in his French grammar, prepared for the Princess Mary, sister of Henry VIII (London, Haukyns, 1530), says "we put 'is' or 's' to a substantive when we wyll express 'possessyon.'" More than twenty years after the publication of the Authorized Version the practice was so uncertain that Butler, while in his English Grammar of 1633 he formally declines "it" with the genitive "its," uses "his" again and again in his volume. Referring to the letter W he speaks of "his name," . . . "his face," and "his shape." In old poems "hyt" is found with a possessive sense.³ But Addison lightly calls the single letter "s" ('s) the "his" or "her" of our forefathers.

¹ The "h," though preserved in "he," "him," "his," "her," has passed out of the neuter "it," originally "hyt" or "hit," as it is yet pronounced by Scottish school boys.

² Palsgrave's *L'Esclaircissement*, VOL. II.

&c., was reprinted in Paris, Imprimerie National, 1852.

³ P. xxiv, *Early English Literature*, Poems, *Early English Text Society*, and in the writings of Sir Thomas More.

In our modern copies the spelling is very often changed from the first edition: "aliant" (Job xix, 15) has become "alien"; "chaws" (Ezek. xxix, 4), "jaws"; "fet," "fetched" (Acts xxviii, 13); "fift," "fifth" (Lev. xxvii, 13); "lese," "lose" (1 Kings xviii, 5); "moe," "more" (Deut. i, 11); "mids," "midst" (Luke xxiii, 45); "terreses," "terraces" (2 Chron. ix, 11); "bowshoot," "bowshot" (Gen. xxi, 16); "moneth," "month" (Exod. xvi, 1); "marish," "marsh"; "thorow," "through"; "thorowout," "throughout"; "flixe" was changed into "flux" (Acts xxviii, 8); "grinne," into "gin" (Job xviii, 9); "counsel" is now "council" (the Sanhedrim); "broided" (1 Tim. ii, 9)—"plaited" in the margin has become "broidered" in several modern editions; and the *n* was sometimes denoted only by a stroke, as in older English; "accompt" has been changed into "account"; and "renowne," into "renown"; "then," as a conjunction, into "than"; "plat," into "plot"; "unpossible" (Matt. xvii, 20) has become "impossible"; but the original form "unperfect" remains in Psalm cxxxix, 16; "unmovable," in Acts xxvii, 41, and 1 Cor. xv, 58; "shipwracke" has been altered in 2 Cor. xi, 25. "Hot" was spelled "whot" (Deut. ix, 19). The form *ie* is the termination of many words now ending in *y*, as carie, citie; *i* and *u* are used for the more modern *j* and *v*; *e* is found often at the end of words as—sunne, moone, starres, signe, arke, farre, yere, hee, shee, bee, rammes skinnes, and in the phrase, "doe the dutie"; past participles are spelt as sowen, growen; shallbe or shal-be is one word; and there are such spellings as bricke kill (Jer. xliii, 9), maner, sope, perfit, battel, enterten, unfained, neeing, "bile," for "boil"; theren, plow, pransings, "lancer," for "lancet"; "mussell," for "muzzle"; "crudle," for "curdle"; "cize," for "size"; "utter," for "outer"; damesell, but not always; "that had bin" occurs Matt. i, 6. "Ought" is an early way of spelling "owed"—"which ought him ten thousand talents" (Matt. xviii, 24)—and the original form was preserved in many editions; "champaign," a level country, is "champion" in the text of Deut. xi, 30; but "champion" in the margin of Ezekiel xxxvii, 2, the only places where the word occurs. Preterite forms are given, as "clipt," "cropt";

"pluckt" and "plucked"; "stopt" and "stopped"; "lift" and "lifted"; "fetcht" and "fetched"; "prey," in the modern editions, is "pray" in the early ones, as Gen. xlix, 9, 27, and so commonly throughout. There are also such varying forms as "burthen" and "burden"; "murther" and "murder"; "hundreth" and "hundred" in consecutive verses, Judg. xviii, 16, 17; "prophane" and "profane"; "toward" and "towards" in the same verse, Gen. xlvi, 13, but made uniform in subsequent editions. There are as great variations in Milton's spelling, even in the first editions of his poems. "Be" is the old form; "thy sins be forgiven thee" (Matt. ix, 2) is not a command or imprecation, but a simple statement, as in Gen. xlii, 8, "for we be brethren"; in Dan. iii, 19, "than it was wont to be heat," the old participle is still a Scotticism, pronounced "het," as "set," which is the past participle of "seat" (Matt. v, 1); "dedicate" in the phrase "he had dedicate," 2 Kings xii, 18, has long since become "had dedicated." Adjectives of this or similar ending, formed from the Latin past participle, are used without an additional syllable, as "situate," "O thou that art situate," Ezek. xxvii, 3. "Thee" is also archaic, as "get thee," "haste thee," "fare thee"; "ye," and seldom "you," as the nominative, though "ye" is often objective in Milton. It would appear that when Milton wrote "yee," or "thee," he occasionally meant the form to be emphatic.¹ "Yee" has been changed into "you" in the more modern editions: Isa. i, 16, "wash you," the change perhaps prompted by the following clause, "make you clean," "you" in the first clause being regarded as objective. The translators in their own preface use "you": "You are risen up in your father's stead"; "as your fathers did, so do you"; but in the translation of both places they keep "ye" (Num. xxxii, 14; Acts vii, 51). "That" is used for "what," "we speak that we do know" (John iii, 11); and several times in this gospel; "thou takest that thou layedst not down" (Luke xix, 21, 22, 26); "if I do that I would not" (Rom. vii, 20; similarly, viii, 25; 2 Cor. viii, 12); "in," as well as "on," is found in connection with "throne" (Prov. xx, 8);

¹ Masson's Milton, vol. III, p. 187

Rev. iii, 21); and in connection with earth (Matt. vi, 10). We have in 1 Kings xvii, 10, "a widow woman was gathering of sticks"; but "gathering two sticks," in verse 12; and in Rev. xviii, 12, "all manner vessels of ivory"; this last idiom occurs in several other places in the first edition.¹ "Whiles" (Matt. v, 25) is a genitive form; in Eph. ii, 13, "sometimes" is simply for "sometime," like "betimes," which has not a plural sense, but means at some early period. We have also "always," "always"; and the phrase "or ever," Psalm xc, 2, "or" being another form of "ere," before, Exodus i, 19, Num xiv, 11, Dan. vi, 24, is a reduplication, like "for because," Gen. xxii, 16. There are also forms of expression which were quite correct and current in the days of Elizabeth and James, and common to the contemporaries of the translators, which are now regarded as out of rule, as Matt. v, 23, "if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee," both verbs being attached to the same conjunction; John ix, 31, "if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will"; the same form of the English verb should have been kept in the successive clauses. Sometimes a strong preterite is found in the one clause and an auxiliary used in the next: Matt. xxv, 26, "reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed," are not out of harmony. The reverse, however, is awkward: "doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth and seeketh"; Acts xxvii, 21, "and not have loosed from Crete, and to have gained this harm and loss"; Jeremiah xxvi, 19, "did he not fear the Lord, and besought the Lord, and the Lord repented?" clauses of the same question; Matt. xxvi, 67, "then did they spit in his face, and buffeted him"; Mark viii, 22, "they bring a blind man unto him, and besought him," a mistranslation. A double negative occurs in 2 Sam. xiv, 7, "shall not leave neither name nor remainder"; also, 1 Cor. x, 32. The old use of grammatical numbers, according to sense and not technical canon, occurs, Acts i, 15, "the number of names together were." On the other hand, "an" is used before a plural, when the objects are taken as a unity: "an eight days after these sayings"

¹ See vol. I., p. 284.

(Luke ix, 28). There are other peculiarities: Gen. xxvii, 15, "goodly raiment which were with her"; Luke v, 10, "so was also James and John." "There was taken up twelve baskets" (Luke ix, 17); "Agrippa and Bernice was entered" (Acts xxv, 23). A singular verb, especially the substantive verb, is often connected with two or more nominatives, as in the concluding clause of the Lord's Prayer—"Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory." Compare Heb. ix, 4; Ezek. ii, 10; Dan. v, 11 vii, 14; Haggai ii, 19; and many other places. In such connections each nominative is singled out in succession, for the sake of emphasis: "the kingdom is thine, and the glory is thine," &c. In the clause, John xi, 57, "If any man knew where he were," "were" was apparently not taken as a subjunctive. "Generation" is represented by "they" in one clause, "they seek a sign"; and by "it" in the next, "no sign shall be given it" (Luke xi, 29); Jer. xviii, 15, similarly, "My people hath forgotten me, they have burned incense"; Matt. xv, 8, "This people draweth nigh with their mouth." Want of uniformity occurs also in these verses in the use of numerals: "One and twentie yeere old" (Jer. lii, 1); "threescore and two yeere old" (Dan. v, 31); "thirty change of garments" (Judges xiv, 13); "in the sixth hundredth and one yeere" (Gen. viii, 13), corrected in 1629; "upon the eight day" (Ezek. xliii, 27). "Then," according to old custom, is used as a conjunction in the clause, "a fool's wrath is heavier then them both" (Prov. xxvii, 3). The expressions "asked an alms" and "so great riches is come to naught," are correct, both nouns being really singular. The phrase, "the which" (Luke xxi, 6; Acts xvii, 31; Colos. iii, 7; Heb. vii, 19; James ii, 7), common in old English, has all but passed away; as also Philemon⁸, "much bold." Modern usage would condemn the connection of "each" or "every one" with a plural following, as in Song of Solomon iv, 2, "whereof every one bear twins"; Matt. xviii, 35, "if ye forgive not every one his brother their trespasses," and this was a common Elizabethan idiom, each having the sense of both the one or the other in combination. The two last words are, however, not genuine in this place, but are an exegetical supplement;

Philip. ii, 3, "let each esteem other better than themselves. "Both" is used with more than two, as in Ezek. ix, 6, "both maids, and little children, and women." "Whom" is not accurate in such phrases as Matt. xvi, 13, 15; Mark viii, 27, 29; Luke ix, 18, 20, "Whom do men say that I am?" "whom say ye that I am?" "whom think ye that I am?" The law of the succession of tenses is sometimes violated, as where "might" is used frequently for "may," Eph. iii, 19, "might" being a past form. "What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? The blind man said unto him, That I might receive my sight," an impossible reference to a past time, and the present "may" is therefore the appropriate auxiliary; so also Luke viii, 9; John v, 40. There is a peculiarity in Prov. vi, 19, "a false witness that speaketh lies, and him that soweth discord among brethren"; "him" remained in the text through many editions, even in that of 1638, and apparently was not changed till 1769. In Heb. ix, 11, 12, we have "Christ being come an high priest . . . he entered," with the other and real nominative in the previous verse, "Christ." There is also the double comparative "lesser," used three times in the text and once in the margin, but occurring a score of times in Shakespeare; and the double superlative, "most straitest sect" (Acts xxvi, 5), an idiom called by Ben Jonson "a certain kind of Atticism"; such double degrees occur often in Shakespeare, "the most unkindest cut of all." There are also double possessives, "a servant of the king's" (2 Kings xxii, 12); "a cunning man . . . of Hiram my father's" (2 Chron. ii, 13); "a servant of the high priest's" (Matt. xxv, 51); "hired servants of my father's" (Luke xv, 17). Other instances have been changed, but in the first edition we have, Deut. xxiii, 25, "the standing corn of thy neighbour's"; Lev. xxii, 10, "a sojourner of the priest's." We have also these peculiar forms—Exod. ix, 4, "the children's of Israel"; Deut. x, 14, "the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the Lord's thy God."

But, in fine, many of the licenses taken by Elizabethan authors were refused by the framers of the present version, for they wrought under the condition and necessary constraint of translators, so that they did not and could not follow Shakes-

peare in using an adverb as a verb or a noun, in employing a noun as an adjective or as an active verb, or in setting an adjective to do duty as an adverb or a noun. Such irregular facilities tended to vigour, clearness, and immediateness of expression, but they could not be adopted in all their exuberance into a work which was to live on untouched by changing literary styles and fashions, and to sustain a fresh and long protest against ephemeral crudities, affected verbal combinations, and ponderous Latinisms in the style of English writers.

CHAPTER XLVI.

THE translators were quite aware of the enmity and opposition which their work was sure to meet with, and their preface opens with distinct anticipations of the calumnies that would be poured upon them.

"Zeale to promote the common good, whether it be by deuising any thing our selues, or reuising that which hath bene laboured by others, deserueth certainly much respect and esteeme, but yet findeth but cold intertainment in the world. It is welcommed with suspicion in stead of loue, and with emulation in stead of thanks: and if there be any hole left for cauill to enter, (and cauill, if it doe not finde a hole, will make one) it is sure to bee misconstrued, and in danger to be condemned. This will easily be granted by as many as know story, or have any experience. For, was there euer any thing projected, that sauoured any way of newnesse or renewing, but the same endured many a storme of gaine-saying, or opposition? A man would thinke that Ciuilitie, holesome Lawes, learning and eloquence, Synods, and Church-maintenance, (that we speake of no more things of this kind) should be as safe as a Sanctuary, and out of shot, as they say, that no man would lift vp the heele, no, nor dogge mooue his tongue against the motioners of them. . . . Thus not only as oft as we speake, as one saith, but also as oft as we do any thing of note or consequence, we subiect our selues to euery ones censure, and happy is he that is least tossed vpon tongues; for vtterly to escape the snatch of them it is impossible."

The version, as had thus been anticipated, soon encoun-

tered opposition, its first antagonist being the scholarly but impracticable Hugh Broughton. He had not been chosen one of the revisers, though he had been all his life writing on the nature and necessity of Biblical revision. On account of his arrogant and perverse temper he was not a "clubbable" man. His great erudition was undoubted, though much of it was spent on smaller matters, especially in discussing the genealogies of Scripture. The learned Lightfoot, his biographer, calls him on the title-page of the volume of his collected works, "the great Albionian Divine, renowned in many nations for his skill in Salem's and Athens' tongues." His style, as admitted by Lightfoot, was "curt, something harsh, and obscure." He wrote sharp criticisms on his rival Lively, and he attacked unsparingly the Bishops' Bible. To crown all, he fell upon Bancroft himself and with poor wit brands him as "the bane of the banned croft," and hints to him in reference to a notorious theological dispute about a middle state, that when his soul shall ascend to Hades, he may find Gehenna there, and that for his raving against truth, King James, to whom the tract is dedicated, "shall behold him from Abraham's bosom." Broughton, being passed by, and not engaged in the work, was, according to Walton,¹ so highly offended that he wrote with more than usual asperity against the Authorized Version. "The late Bible was," he intimates, "sent me to censure, which bred in me a sadness which will grieve me while I breathe. It is so ill done. Tell his Majesty that I had rather be rent in pieces with wild horses than any such translation, by my consent, should be urged on poor churches. . . . My advertisement they regarded not"—the allusion being to their translation of the last clause of Gen. iv, 26. In reference to Luke iii, and the phrase "the Son of God," he maintains that in fifteen verses they have "fifteen scores of idle words for account in the day of judgment, the relation of each name being to Christ." He adds, "when the genealogy was attacked, I cleared our Lord's family"; Bancroft raved and gave the anathema,

¹ Todd's Memoirs of Walton, vol. I, p. 92; Lewis' History of Translations, p. 297, 3rd edition.

"Christ judged his own cause." Broughton's other charges are based on St. Stephen's speech, on which he dogmatizes without throwing light upon it; on the Seventy Weeks in Daniel; on the translation of the names of precious stones;¹ the spelling of proper names; and on Daniel xi, 38, "where they leave atheism in the text, and put my translation into the margin." He admits, however, "I blame not this that they keep the usual style of former translations. For the learned the Genevan might be made exact, for which pains for whole thirty years I have been called upon, and I spent much time, to my great loss, by wicked hindrance."²

Such were the impressions of Broughton's erudition and vanity that when he went to the continent it was said that he had gone to teach the Jews Hebrew. His "coat bare the bird of Athens"; and as he helped Speed to compile the genealogies found in the earlier edition of the present Bible, the two owls with a burning torch found at the top corners of the first page mean that "it was Mr. Broughton that gave the light in that work."³ There is a sprightly caricature of Broughton's subjects and style in Ben Johnson's *Alchemist*, act iv, scene 3.

Dr. Gell, who had been chaplain to Archbishop Abbot, published, in 1659, an attack—"a skeleton of mere criticisms"—upon the version and its framers. Some of his accusations are very trivial, and many of his statements are drawn out into prolix allegorical sermons. He objects to their inversion of the order of words, to their undue use of supplemental terms, and to their translation as being moulded to suit their own opinions, while they put the better and truer rendering in the margin. Especially does he censure their Bible as obscuring

¹ Bancroft, in writing to Cowell, touching Translating the Bible," Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, says 1595.

² Works, p. 661, &c., London, 1662.

³ The genealogies and the description of the Holy Land, in the first edition, were compiled by royal authority, as was told by the delegates to the Synod of Dort.

on purpose the doctrine of perfection, for he regarded such a state as attainable in the present life.¹ They predicted that "uncharitable imputations" would be cast on them and their work, and Broughton and Gell soon verified the prophecy.² Nor have they been the only opponents. But such baseless objections as those brought by Bellamy and Sir James Burges, and recently renewed by Mr. Street,³ against the version that it was taken from the Septuagint, have been sufficiently exposed by Brett, Whittaker, and Todd.

A portion of the arguments which Gregory Martin had used many years before against the current Protestant versions was taken up and repeated by Thomas Ward⁴ against the present Bible, the edition singled out being that of Bill and Barker, 1683. This book, "Errata of the Protestant Bible," seems to have been published anonymously in the reign of James II.; and a second edition appeared in 1688. It was reprinted in Dublin in 1807, issued with a preface by Lingard in 1810, and with a letter by Milner in 1841. Ward calls his work an abridgment, "suited not only to the purse of the poorest, but to the capacity of the most ignorant." He excels his predecessor in ferocity of epithet, accuses King James's translators of blasphemy, most damnable corruptions, intolerable deceit, and vile imposture, these epithets not being "the dictates of passion, but the just resentment of a zealous mind." Of damnable corruptions there are one hundred and twenty, and twenty errors in addition are not regarded as the product of ill design. Many of Ward's alleged corruptions are now found in the Catholic version itself: it has been so

¹ Essay towards the amendment in." By the Rev. B. Street, vicar of the last English Translation, Barnsley-le-Wold. London, 1872.

London, 1659.

² Baxter refers to Gell as one of the sowers of religious discord in the Parliamentary army, especially in Colonel Whalley's regiment. These "sectmasters fiercely cried down the present translation of the Scripture."

³ Restoration of Paths to Dwell and Hamilton.

⁴ Ward was a schoolmaster who had gone over to the Church of Rome in the days of James II. He then travelled in Italy, and served as a soldier in the Papal Guards. He also published "England's Reformation, in Hudibrastic verse." Ward was replied to by Grier, Ryan,

much altered from time to time. The answer of Fulke to Martin still suffices to refute such polemical objections, and some of the older incorrect renderings have been changed in our present version. One grievous complaint was the use of the term "images," as in 1 John v, "Babes, keep yourselves from images"; 2 Cor. vi, 16, "how agreeth the temple of God with images?" Eph. v, 5, "nor covetous person who is a worshipper of images." The Catholics, allowing idolatry to be wrong, felt that these renderings condemned their practice of having images in their churches, and suggested to the people the destruction of them. But the accusation does not apply to the Authorized Version, for the Greek word and its compounds are rendered idol, idolater, and idolatry. Many of the Fathers, indeed, as Jerome, could not distinguish between the worship of images and that of idols, and practically to the masses they are the same; yet it was right to indicate the distinction between two Greek terms.¹ The Genevan had already set the example of a correct rendering.

Among the charges brought against the new version the most absurd and ludicrous is, that through royal influences the translation was worded so as to countenance the notion of witchcraft. Dr. Samuel Johnson,² after telling of James's great skill in witchcraft and referring to his Treatise on Demonology printed at Edinburgh and reprinted in London soon after his accession, adds that "as the ready way to gain King James's favour was to flatter his speculations, the system of Demonology was adopted by all who desired either to gain preferment or not to lose it." These words do not contain any definite accusation against the translators, though they have been supposed to do so. But Bishop Huchinson in his "Historical Essay on Witchcraft" asserts in the same spirit and more directly, after referring to the statute against conjuration, "The translation of the Bible being made soon after, by King James's particular desire, hath received some phrases that favour the vulgar notions more than the old translations did. At that unhappy

> ¹ Such as *εἰκών* and *εἰδωλον*.

² Works, vol. X, p. 76, London, 1823.

> time was brought in the gross notion of a familiar spirit . . . these translations being introduced for the great reverence they had to the King's judgment and the testimony he gave them of facts from Scotland." A professed commentator also, Rev. John Hewlet, B.D., who published an exposition of the Bible in 1812—the notes of which were reprinted in 1816—declares without reserve that the translators introduced the term "familiar spirit," "witch," and "wizard," to flatter the notions of royalty.

But whatever the king's opinions were on this subject, the terms objected to occur in the earlier versions, and were therefore not introduced by the king's translators. Both the two preceding versions in concurrent use had in the story of her of Endor the phrase "familiar spirit" three times (1 Sam. xxviii, 7, 8), though they rendered the phrase "them that had familiar spirits and the wizards" in 3, and in 9 by "sorcerers" and "soothsayers." In the Great Bible, 1540, a "familiar spirit" is rendered a "spirit of prophecy," and by Coverdale, "spirit of soothsaying." Both the Genevan and the Bishops' have in Exodus xxii, 18, "thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," and the Bishops' has the following note, "the word in Hebrew signifieth a witch or sorcerer, or an enchanter, or any that by devilish means hurteth either cattle, corn, or men." The translators, though they accepted the text, pointedly refused this note which was after the king's own heart. "Witch" is also the translation of the other earlier versions. Nay, in Isaiah lvii, 3, where the Genevan has "witches children," the Authorized does not copy, but has used "sorceress." In both the Wycliffite versions Simon is called a witch, the noun being at that early period of both genders. Belief in witchcraft was very current in Europe before the period of James I. Many mediaeval councils, synods, and papal Bulls had maintained the reality of it, and there is an immense body of literature on the subject. Wierus had written in 1583, and Reginald Scott in the following year. A statute had been passed against witchcraft in 1541 (33 Henry VIII, c. 8), and it was renewed at the accession of Elizabeth before any law was enacted in Scotland. Witchcraft figures prominently in many dramas. At a later period

Glanville, Henry More, Sir Matthew Hale (who condemned two women to death at Bury St. Edmunds in 1665), the Mathers in America, Professor Sinclair of Glasgow University,¹ Sir Thomas Brown, the "Exposer of Vulgar Errors," and good John Wesley, expressed their firm conviction of the reality of it. The penal laws in existence at that time against it, which had been passed (1 James I, c. 12) when Coke was Attorney-General, and Bacon a member of Parliament, were not repealed till 1736.² Chief-Justice Holt, in 1702, punished witchcraft as an imposture. The belief in witches was also intensely prevalent in Scotland. The General Assembly had often taken up the matter, and the early Seceders set down among the signs of spiritual declension the cessation of witch-burning. The last instance in England of witch-burning occurred in 1716, and in Scotland in 1720.

Most extraordinary statements have also been made about the relations of the translators and their work to the king. Two Transatlantic authors, in a joint production written in defence of the "Bible Union" and its avowedly Baptist version, affirm amidst much wrathful and senseless vituperation that the translators intended to flatter James by the rendering "God save the king"—"a phrase at war with all of God's revelations on kingly governments," and they give us the astounding intelligence that the monarch himself was the manager and final reviser of the Authorized Version—"those royal hands, dripping with the blood of hundreds of innocent human beings, gave the final touches to it."³ Such statements

¹ See vol. I, p. 236.

² See Huchinson's Essay on Witchcraft, 1718; Upham's Salem Witchcraft, Boston, 1867; the first chapter of Lecky's Rationalism, vol. I, London, 1866, 3rd ed., and *De la Demonialité*, par Isidore Liseux, Paris, 1875.

³ Discussion on Revision of the Holy Scripture, p. 113, 208. By James Edmunds, and T. S. Bell, Louisville, Ky., 1856. In a small

book, "New Testament Studies by Aliquis," London, 1870, it is said that King James probably introduced the word "Easter" in Acts xii, 5. But "Easter" is as old as Tyndale's first edition. Another conjecture of the same author may be taken for what it is worth, when he hints that it is not improbable that the king wrote the "flattering dedication" to himself.

need no reply. The phrase "God save the king" was not coined by the translators—they found it both in the Bishops' and in the Genevan; the Great Bible and Matthew (Tyndale) having, in 1 Sam. x, 24, "God lend the king life," and Coverdale, "God save the new king."

Undue ecclesiastical predilections have been charged against the revisers. Thus the rendering "tables" in Mark vii, 4, has been branded as an attempt to hide the meaning of immersion as identified with washing. But the margin has "beds" from the Rheims, and "tables" is as old as Tyndale's first edition and is found in subsequent versions. It has also been alleged, and not without some reason, that in Acts xx, 28, the rendering of the clause "over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers" is a deflection from the true translation, and conceals the identity of the "elders" with the office-bearers usually named "bishops." It is quite true that the word given as "overseer" is, even as applied to Christ, everywhere rendered "bishop"; but perhaps the translation in Acts was meant to bring out the duties or functions of the office—"bishop" being a foreign term with a technical signification. But while it would have been better to preserve uniformity, it must be added at the same time that our translators did not introduce the variation, for "overseers" is in Tyndale 1526 and 1534, in Cranmer 1540, in both Genevan versions, and in the Bishops'; "bishops" being found in Wycliffe, Coverdale, and the Rheims. Wycliffe often renders "high priest" by "bishop," and the note of the Rheims is "bishops or priests."

Dr. Hill is reported by Henry Jessey, in a paper on revision, to have said in open assembly, "It was commonly reported that Bancroft, in order that the translation should 'speak prelatial language' had altered it in fourteen places; and that Dr. Miles Smith's complaint was that 'he is so potent that there is no contradicting him.'"¹ But we have no direct means of ascertaining whether the statement be true, only we know that Bancroft was among the first to defend episcopacy

¹ Henry Jessey was the author of the words of the New Testament," an English-Greek Lexicon "for all London, 1661.

as of absolute divine right, and he certainly had a temper and a will that could bear down all opposition.¹ This story, however, had so firm a hold on the popular mind that about 1657 it formed the preamble of a "bill for revising the English translation of the Scriptures," in the following terms:—

"Whereas by the reverend, godly, and learned Dr. Hill, it was publicly declared in his sermon before an honourable assembly,² and by himself since that time published in print, that when the Bible had been translated by the translators appointed, the New Testament was looked over by some prelates (that he could name) to bring it to speak the prelatial language, and he was informed by one that lived then, a great observer of those times, fourteen places in the New Testament, whereof he instanceth these in five or six places by them corrupted.

"The like testimony of these prelates wronging that new and best translation being given by some other ancient and godly preachers also, who lived in those times.

"And some appearance hereof may yet be seen in part of that very copy of these translators."³

Questions of doctrines are said to have warped the judgment of the translators. A passage often adduced in proof is Heb. vi, 4, 5, 6, and attention is called to the misrendering "if they shall fall away," which certainly ought to have been "and have fallen away," for it is in a line with the previous past participles. But if the mistranslation had been chosen to guard the indefectibility of grace the artifice is an early one, for it is found in the older versions from Tyndale downwards, with the exception of the Rheims. The revisers did not introduce the mistranslation, and they so often follow the old versions, that all we are warranted to say is that their theology may have inclined them to contentment with the established rendering.

¹ He died Nov. 2, 1610. He became Bishop of London in 1597, and Archbishop of Canterbury in Dec., 1604. ² State Paper Office, Domest. Interreg., Bundle 662, f. 12.

³ Spittal Sermon, on Eph. iv, 15—

Beza encouraged them.¹ They might have got rid of the difficulty by saying, with Calvin and Beza, that the persons described and characterized in the previous clauses have never been regenerate; or, with Alford, that "the regenerate may fall away, but the elect never can"; "All elect are regenerate, but all regenerate are not elect." Still, and at whatever hazard, they ought to have given the right translation, which in this clause does not declare a contingency, but a fact ranked in the same category with enlightenment, tasting of the heavenly gift, and participation of the Holy Ghost.

In the first clause of Matt. v, 21, "said by them of old time," our translators forsake the older versions and follow Beza,² the rendering being vindicated by him only for its fitness, as singling out the teachers not the auditors; though they put "by" into the text, they give us "to" in the margin.

No little censure has been pronounced upon the rendering of Heb. x, 38, "now the just³ shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." The words "any man" represent no corresponding Greek term in the original, and though they are a supplement, they were not printed as such in the early editions, as only since 1638 are they presented in italics. Our translators were very careless and inconsistent about what are now called italics; but in this case they could not be ignorant of the bearing of their version on the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, and they ought to have anxiously attended to the printing. They knew that there was no nominative expressed; that their rendering was based on an interpretation which to be borne out supposed that the phrase "any man" is fairly and fully implied in the verse; so that their supplement, as it was exegetical and liable to be contraverted, should have been honestly and carefully marked. But as we know their practice as to italics was in defiance of all uniformity, we dare not say that the non-marking of the two words was intended to serve any polemical purpose, for such

¹ By his *si prolabantur*, the Vulgate having *et prolapsi sunt*.

² *Dictum a veteribus*, the Vulgate having *dictum est antiquis*.

³ The best text gives "my righteous one."

a device would have been too transparent; and if they had any theological bias, they were not such simpletons as to endeavour in this way to veil it. Now we are not going to expound the verse, but as some apology for them it may be noted that in the quotation from the Septuagint Version of Habakkuk ii, 4, there is a transposition of the clauses, and that scholars who do not hold the dogma supposed to have suggested the rendering, agree with them in the supplement. Capellus, Scholefield, and Grotius give "any one," and so does Bishop Middleton; while Winer and De Wette supply "a man" as a general term abstracted from the epithet "just man." A similar nominative would be supplied to the verb as it stands in the first clause in the Septuagint; but Bleek is at a loss as to the nominative which should be taken, while Delitzsch argues that the clauses are inverted by the Apostle to make the subject no longer doubtful. Besides the original clause carries a meaning very different from that found in the quotation, as it reads, "Behold his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him," or "puffed up with pride his soul is not right in him." Owen, Lindsay, and many others consider that two classes of persons are contrasted; Beza, explaining, "a just man is opposed to an impious one,"¹ as in the Septuagint. In their difficulty the translators followed Beza,² but when they left the natural and grammatical connection of the clauses, they ought not only to have imitated Beza's honest italics, but to have given the other rendering in the margin, "if he draw back." Nay, it was the more incumbent on them to append such a marginal alternative, because they have forsaken all the older versions with the exception of the Genevan, since from Tyndale down to the Bishops' the rendering is, "and if he withdraw himself."

Theological prepossession is also ascribed to the rendering of Acts ii, 47, "and the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." This rendering of the Greek participle is certainly unfortunate—for it is present—literally "of those being saved." Had they followed their theology, they might have

¹ "Fidelis opponitur impio."

² "At si quis se subduxerit," printing *quis* in italics.

rendered, "the saved," as they have done in 2 Cor. ii, 15, men being saved as soon as they believe—"he that believeth hath life," and in consequence it was held that their ultimate salvation was certain, or that they "should be saved." But in their translation they simply follow the older versions and they accept the Vulgate.¹ Wycliffe in defiance of his Latin text renders, "them that weren maad safe." One objection to the rendering "are saved" is that, while in form it is an English present, in sense it is really a past, and there is also an objection to the phrase, "should be saved," since it shows a close similarity to another translation of different Greek in Acts xxiii, 27, "this man was taken of the Jews, and should have been killed."

Anti-Popish leanings are also alleged to shine through in the version. Thus, in 1 Cor. xi, 27, "wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup unworthily," the translation ought to be "or drink this cup," "or" being corrupted into "and" to destroy a possible argument for communion in one kind. The particle² stands unchallenged in Stephens and Beza, and there is no allusion to any other reading. Codex A was not accessible to them, but the Vulgate and the Peshito read "and" as also Clement, and Origen in his Commentary. When they saw that "and" occurred in 26, 28, 29, they were naturally tempted to insert it here. They found also the older versions divided—Tyndale and Cranmer having "or," and Coverdale, the Genevan, and the Bishops' having "and." Macknight too, who had little sympathy with their theology and no great admiration of their learning, justifies their preference of "and," giving among other reasons the false one that though η may be the right reading, it often means "and," and ought to be so translated in this verse, as determined by v. 29. But though they never render this conjunction by "and," they seem, however, to have persuaded themselves that "and"³ was the right reading here; for though they knew little of MSS., they knew something of the Peshito and of Patristic quotations. They were too shrewd not to perceive on the one hand the utter worth-

¹ "Qui salvi fierent."

² η

³ καί.

lessness of the Popish argument in defence of communion in one kind, and not to feel on the other hand that the use of "and" narrows the range of the Apostle's warning, which with "or" affixed the penalty to either act of eating or of drinking.

Gregory Martin finds fault with the rendering, Heb. xi, 21, "worshipped, leaning on the top of his staff," as directed against the adoration of creatures called "dulia." But the version is correct, and the supplementary word conveys the real sense, while the Rheims translators, after the Vulgate, have "adored the top of his rod"; the rod is Jacob's own, and not, as many Catholic interpreters suppose, the sceptre of Joseph, on the top of which was some image or symbol. The pointing of the Hebrew noun is doubtful, and it may mean either "bed" or "rod."

The Authorized Version has been often accused, as by Mac-knight, Campbell, and many others, of following Beza in its translation. Such imitation was natural in the circumstances, for Beza was a Greek scholar, with few equals or superiors in those times. "Without controversy" (1 Tim. iii, 16) is from Beza and Erasmus. The misrendering, "the terror of the Lord" (2 Cor. v, 11), came from the Genevan, and it from Beza. The wrong translation in Jude 12, "trees whose fruit withereth," came also from Beza, the sense being "autumn trees without fruit."¹ "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature" (2 Cor. v, 17) is after Beza, Tyndale, and the Great Bible; but another rendering, that of the Genevan, is given in the margin — "let him be a new creature." Yet, while Beza was closely consulted and frequently followed, it is also certain that his influence was not uniformly paramount, even in cases where a similar theological bias might be anticipated. In rendering the clause, Matt. iii, 15, "suffer it to be so now," the revisers refuse "let be," the equivocal version of the Genevan 1560, and also Beza's strange translation.² They translate fairly in places where he paraphrases wrongly, as Matt. vii, 23, "ye that work iniquity," Beza having, "who sin on purpose."³ Nor do they

¹ "Frugiperdae."

² "Omitte."

³ "Qui operam datis iniquitati."

copy his annotation in Matt. v, 20, where he virtually identifies righteousness with orthodoxy, and explains "entering into the kingdom" by "becoming teachers in the church." They indeed appear to follow him, and not the Vulgate,¹ in rendering "his faith was counted for righteousness" (Rom. iv, 3), and yet they are only keeping by the earlier Protestant versions of Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Cranmer, the Genevan, and the Bishops'. They do not accept Beza's rendering when they translate in Acts iii, 21, "whom the heaven must receive"; nor in ii, 27, 31, "leave my soul in hell"; Beza's first rendering being, "my corpse in the grave";² and though he changed it because it gave offence, he still upheld it to be correct; the two Genevan versions follow him, and he vindicates the rendering in a full note. Beza is not followed in John i, 12, "dignity to be sons of God"; but "power" is the word selected—the Genevan having in the margin "privilege or dignity." Nor is he followed in Acts i, 14, where he renders "with their wives," the proper translation being, "with the women"; nor do they take his and the Vulgate rendering, "spirit of sanctification," in Rom. i, 1, nor in Heb. ix, 15, for he has "covenant," and in the passage he is followed once by the Genevan of 1557 and twice by the Bishops' which has "testament" in the margin. They also forsake Beza in Gal. i, 24, "they glorified God in me"—he having, "concerning me," and Tyndale having, "on my behalf." Nor do they take instruction from Beza in James ii, 14, where they render "can faith save him?" Beza having "can that faith save him?"³ They were under sore temptation to preserve the "illa," but they go away so far from Beza that they even ignore the article, which may have its contextual sense. The one Genevan has "that faith," and the other, "the faith." In 1 Cor. xiii, 2, Beza renders the same adjective first by "all,"⁴ and then by "whole,"⁵ and vindicates the alteration on polemical grounds; but the English version has rightly given "all knowledge," and "all faith."

¹ "Ad justitiam."

² "Cadaver meum in sepulchro."

³ "Num potest fides illa eum servare?"

⁴ "Omnia."

⁵ "Totam."

Rom. ii, 7, is translated, "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, and honour, and immortality, eternal life." But Beza, as if afraid of the connection of the patient continuance in "well-doing" with glory and ultimate eternal life, separates the words and renders, "to them who according to patient expectation seek the glory of a good work." There are different modes of construction; but Beza's exegesis, "that is, who seek eternal life," is wholly unjustifiable. Rom. v, 16, "judgment was by one to condemnation," Beza translates, "the guilt, indeed, is of one offence to condemnation," implying a distinct doctrinal bias and a mistranslation of the noun.

Rom. viii, 4, "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us";¹ here the Greek term, however, is not that rendered usually by righteousness, but a word which may mean the whole requirement of the law. Whether he be right or wrong, Beza did not lead them; they virtually followed Tynedale, "the righteousness required by the law."

Rom. xi, 32, "That he might have mercy upon all." Beza renders the last words, "all these,"² his explanation being "elect," viz.,—but he was not imitated.

1 Tim. ii, 4, "Who will have all men to be saved"; Beza translates,³ "who will have any men to be saved."

1 Tim. ii, 6, "Gave himself a ransom for all"; Beza rendering⁴ by the same pronoun. But the revisers of 1611 without hesitation disavow these unfaithful versions. 1 Tim. iv, 10, "Who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe"; Beza preserves the "all," and he could not well attempt its alteration; but he changes "Saviour" into "Pre-server," as if the statement referred to temporal preservation; and to show under what pressure he must have made the change, this is the only place in his New Testament where he has ventured on such a translation, which our version at once tosses aside, and follows all the earlier English translations.

¹ "Ut jus illud legis compleatur in nobis."

² "Omnes illos."

³ "Qui quosvis homines."

⁴ "Pro quibusvis."

If the Authorized Version, in connecting "all men" with "appeared," steps back from the true translation in Titus ii, 11, it is put in the margin; and there is no hesitation in rendering Heb. ii, 9, "that he . . . should taste death for every man," the defining supplement "man" not even printed in italics. Thus, while the revisers of 1611 were often tempted to follow Beza, they had often the courage to judge for themselves. At the same time some of the most erroneous marginal renderings came from Beza: Mark i, 34, "or, to say that they knew him"; similarly, Luke iv, 41; Acts i, 8, "or, the power of the Holy Ghost coming upon you"; Rom. xi, 17, "or, for them."

The revisers occasionally fall from the full and simple meaning of the text. Sometimes they insert a diluting supplement. 2 Thess. iii, 5, in rendering the last clause "into the patient waiting for Christ," after Beza's "*expectationem*," they shrank from the real translation and put it into the margin, "into the patience of Christ." It was probably some felt incongruity in the true rendering, "leadeth us in triumph" (2 Cor. ii, 14), that prompted the inferior version, "causeth us to triumph," after Beza.

Though the charge of theological bias cannot be fully supported against the text, the margin, however, yields some examples.

Rom. iii, 25, text, "set forth"; margin, "foreordained"—a verb taken from the Vulgate, and occurring only once in the version, 1 Pet. i, 20, where it should be "foreknown." Rom. v, 12, text, "for that¹ all have sinned"; margin, "in whom all have sinned," after Augustine and Beza—a rendering which even Calvin himself did not adopt. "In which" is used in the Rheims,² but "forasmuch as" is the translation both in the Genevan and in the Bishops'.

¹ ἐφ' ᾧ.

² Vulgate, "*in quo*."

CHAPTER XLVII.

THERE are, however, several things about the translation which detract somewhat from its great excellence. They can scarcely be said to be of the essence of it, but they are very closely connected with it. The fourteen original rules given to the Companies at Westminster, Oxford, and Cambridge, make no reference to the use of supplemental words; but the sixth rule presented by the English deputies to the Synod of Dort was to this effect, "that the words necessary to be inserted into the text, in order to complete the sense, were to be distinguished by being printed in another and smaller character."¹ In a popular translation, such as that of the Bible, such supplemental words are indispensable in many places. But whatever accuracy might appear in their own copy, the printing was done in a very careless way, being devoid of all uniformity; and in the anxiety to be intelligible, or in their own phrase, "to be understood even of the very vulgar," the supplemental words were inserted with liberal allowances. To show how the supplemented words have been treated, and how largely such words have been put into italic types, it may be mentioned that in the first edition the eleventh chapter of John has no supplements printed in italics; that in the revised edition of 1638 it has fifteen words so marked; while some modern editions have as many as sixteen such terms.² In Exodus xxxii, 18, in the midst of twenty-five words, there are now eleven italic words,

¹ See page 201.

² Turton's Text of the English Bible, *passim*, Cambridge, 1833.

but only five in the first edition. In some New Testaments issued at Edinburgh, of last century, there is not a single word printed in italics from beginning to end of the volume. In the first edition these words were printed in Roman, the text being in black letter, but when it was printed in Roman, they were presented in italic letter. Some supplemental words are indispensable: Genesis xxi, 33, "*Abraham* planted"; xxv, 8, "*full of years*"; Exodus xxxiv, 7, "*clear the guilty*"; Numbers xv, 26, "*gathered unto his people*"; John iv, 33, "*brought him ought to eat*"; vi, 1, "*the sea of Galilee, which is the sea of Tiberias*"; xv, 18, "*ye know that it hated me before it hated you*"; 25, "*this cometh to pass*"; xix, 5, "*and Pilate said unto them*"—the proper name being introduced to give consecutive clearness to the narrative; 1 John ii, 2, "*the sins of the whole world*"; ii, 19, "*they went out.*" The Saviour's name is inserted often in the gospels where it is not required.

Not a few of the numerous italic words should be excluded. In many cases the supplement is included in the original idiom, as that of the substantive verb between a subject and a predicate—or in a simple assertion: Genesis ii, 12, "*the gold of that land is good*," or Matt. v, 3, "*blessed are the poor in spirit.*" The supplied verb is really borne in by the original phrase as an essential portion of it, and needs not be put in italics. Of this kind there are numerous instances. There are other cases where the italic words introduced for the sake of connection may be often omitted, as the participle "*saying*" when the oblique form suddenly changes into the direct: "He spake, *saying*," "to curse and to swear, *saying*." Instances are perpetually occurring: Ps. xlv, 8, "*an evil disease, say they, cleaveth fast unto him*"; 1 Chron. xxiii, 5, "*the instrument which I made, said David*"; Acts i, 4, "*which, saith he, ye have heard of me.*" The result of a previous condition, or contingency, is omitted sometimes in the original, but is supplied in the version; Luke xiii, 9, "*if it bear fruit,—well.*" The emphasis is more striking without any insertion in Exodus xxxii, 32, "*yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—; and, if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book.*" There is

a host of idiomatic adjectives which contain their object in themselves, and many verbs have a similar pregnancy—as “dry land,” “bitter herbs,” “cold water,” “draw sword,” “draw water,” “set in array,” “tread grapes,” “shut the door,” “sitteth on eggs,” “feed the flock”—and there is no weighty reason why such supplied terms should be in italics. Many particles are found in italics—“like,” “as,” a weakening of the Hebrew metaphor; “and,” “when,” “though,” “that,” having their origin in the change of the simple and sequent Hebrew clauses into the more intricate English syntax. Italics may be allowed for such words, if they cannot be omitted without detriment. There are also cases of zeugmas, as 1 Tim. iv, 3, “forbidding to marry, *and commanding* to abstain from meats”; 1 Cor. xiv, 34, “*they are commanded to be under*”; or the supplement is suggested by a previous clause, “as thou didst deal with my father, *even so deal with me*,” 2 Chron. ii, 3; Ps. ix, 18, “the expectation of the poor shall *not* perish,” the negative being carried from a previous clause. There are many expletives which might be dispensed with, as “even” and “namely.” In John viii, 6, the whole clause inserted, “*as though he heard them not*,” is from a various reading of no authority. Besides, many of the supplied words are directly expository: Gen. xviii, 28, “*for lack of five*”; Num. xiv, 28, “*as truly as I live*”; 2 Sam. v, 8, “*he shall be chief and captain*,” taken from 1 Chron. xi, 6; 2 Kings x, 24, “*he that letteth him go*”; Psalms lviii, 7, “*his bow to shoot*”; 1 Peter v, 13, “*the church that is at Babylon*.” The same practice is found in some doubtful cases: Job iii, 23, “*why is light given*”; 1 Chron. ix, 41, “*and Ahaz*,” taken from viii, 35; 1 Chron. xxiv, 23, “*the sons of Hebron*”; “*Jeriah, the first*,” taken from xxiii, 19. 2 Chron. xxiv, 6, “*according to the commandment*”; Job xix, 26, “*and though after my skin worms destroy this body*”; xxxv, 3, “*if I be cleansed*”; Ps. vii, 11, “*God is angry with the wicked every day*”; liv, 7, “*his desire*”; lxix, 22, “*that which should have been . . . let it become*”; 1 Cor. i, 26, “*not many noble are called*”; Deut. xxxiii, 6, “*let not his men be few*,” directly the opposite of what the Hebrew asserts; Exodus,

xii, 36, “they lent unto them *such things as they required*”; Nehem. xii, 31, “*companies of them that gave*,” also in 38 and 40; 2 Sam. xxiii, 8, “*he lift up his spear*.” Several instances found in Samuel are borrowed from Chronicles.¹ “From” might be omitted three times in Matt. iv, 25, and “pray God” might be omitted in 1 Thess. v, 23, and in 2 Tim. iv, 16; “which is” might disappear from 1 Tim. i, 1; “who is” in Rev. i, 5; “with thee” in 2 Tim. iv, 13; Eccles. viii, 2, “*I counsel thee*; Ps. lxx, 1, “*make haste*”; Judges vii, 7, 8, “*the other people . . . the rest of Israel*; 2 Sam. i, 21, “*as though he had not been*”; 2 Sam. xv, 32, “*the mount*.” Might not, “if possible” suffice for “*if it were possible*,” Matt. xxiv, 24; “*the passover*” for “*the feast of the passover*”? Matt. xxvi, 2; “*a wine-fat*” for “*a place for the wine-fat*,” Mark xii, 1; “*between us*” might be omitted in Eph. ii, 14; “*manner of*” in Rev. xxii, 2. In 1 Cor. xiv, 33, the supplement, “*the author*” should go out—“God is not the God of confusion”; nor is “*fellow*” very appropriate in Matt. xxvi, 61, and in various other places—it came from Tyndale. The supplied phrase, “*and looked*,” is wholly uncalled for in John xx, 11. The words “*that had been*” are wrong in Matt. i, 6, though they are true in themselves, and “*in*” is wrong in ii, 6; “*the Father*” is a direct and doubtful exegesis in Col. i, 19. The words “*it will be*” only weaken the saying in Matt. xvi, 2, 3; the verses, however, are doubtful. The epithet “*unknown*” as applied to tongues in 1 Cor. xiv, 2, 4, 13, 14, has no right to be there, for it is an assumed explanation; while in the other verses it is not given, though the reference be the same as in verse 5, 6, 18, &c., and the words “*they are commanded*” are quite superfluous in the 34th verse of the same chapter, so is “*kind of*” in xv, 39; and “*was made*” in verse 45; “*henceforth*” in Eph. iv, 14, and it was not so printed in the first edition. 1 Cor. v, 3, reads, “for I verily as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already as though I were present *concerning* him that hath so done this deed”; but “concerning” may be omitted, as “him” is the direct accusative or object to the verb judged, “concerning” being

¹ See Scrivener's Introduction to the Cambridge Bible, p. xxxiv.

probably suggested by the marginal reading "appointed" for judged, and as it is not printed in italic in the first edition. The epithet "*venomous*" is wholly unwarranted in Acts xxviii, 4; the beast was venomous, as the cry of the natives implies, but it is not called so by the historian, nor did the older versions use the adjective, and it is not printed in italics in the first edition. It may have been supposed to be contained in the Greek substantive, which is sometimes rendered "wild beast," but most frequently simply "beast," as in the following verse 5, and throughout the Apocalypse. Matt. xx, 23, reads, "to sit on my right hand and my left is not mine to give, but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared of my father." This translation virtually represents Jesus as denying his supreme and blessed prerogative, and the italic words help out the perversion. The idiomatic brevity of the original must be made intelligible by some supplement, "is not mine to give but *to them* for whom." In the first edition the words are not italicized in the corresponding passage in Mark. In Ps. xix, 3, the italic words "*there is*" . . . "*where*" completely mar the meaning, the margin giving the true sense. In 2 Cor. viii, 4, the phrase "*take upon us*" may be dispensed with, and a different reading justifies the omission. The words printed in italic in Heb. ii, 16, "*him the nature of angels*," are wrong in every sense, and the margin gives the true rendering. In Heb. vii, 19, "*did*" presents a wrong exegesis; "*the Lord*" is not needed in James ii, 1; and "*for us*" should not be in Heb. ix, 12.

Many supplements are thus interpretations. Num. v, 13, "*with the manner*"; 1 John iii, 16, "*of God*"; "*God*," "calling upon *God*," Acts vii, 59; 2 Cor. vi, 1, "*with him*"; Ps. lxxiii, 25, "*but thee*"; 1 John ii, 19, "*no doubt*"; Ps. xxvii, 8, "*when thou saidst*"; 13, "*I had fainted*"; Ps. cix, 4, "*give myself unto*"; Ps. xxxiv, 17, "*the righteous*"; Ps. cxi, 10, "*his commandments*"; Ps. cxxxix, 16, "*my members*"; 1 Cor. iv, 7, "*from another*"; 1 Peter i, 22, "*see that ye*"; Rev. iii, 12, "*I will write upon him*"; Mark xii, 34, "*any question*"; Matt. xxii, 46, "*questions*"; Luke xx, 40, "*question at all*," not found in italics in the earlier edition, and rightly,

because they are distinctly contained in the Greek verb. An opposite change has also been made in the edition of 1611. Gal. i, 8, has in different type the words, "*any other gospel*"; and in the following verse the same Greek is rendered by the same words, but without any change of type. The words are contained in the Greek verb, and since 1638 italics have been properly dispensed with. Why intrude the words "*because I know*" in Acts xxvi, 3? The literal rendering does not stand in need of any ekeing out whatever: "I think myself happy that I am to answer for myself this day before thee . . . because thou art expert in all customs"—the verbose supplement may have been suggested by the change of case in the Greek.

The following are unwarranted supplements: Acts xxvii, 44, "*broken pieces of the ship*"—the words are an interpolation. Gal. iii, 24, "*our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ*," "*schoolmaster*" not being the true rendering; Col. i, 4, "*which ye have*"; v. 16, "*they be*"; iii, 4, "*who is*"; Luke xviii, 16, "*unto him*"; 31, "*unto him*," for in both the compound verb contains the idea conveyed in the italic words; Matt. xxiv, 40, reads, "then shall two be in the field," but "two men" should have been the rendering; and with the usual inconsistency the following verse reads, "*two women* shall be grinding at the mill," the proper translation, but women should not be in italics, as the gender of the participle suggests or demands it. Similarly in Luke xvii, 34, "men" is implied in the gender of the numeral and adjective, and "women" in the participle "grinding"; in verse 36 the same thing occurs, but the margin declares that the verse is "wanting in most of the Greek copies." A possessive pronoun representing the article need not in ordinary cases be put into italics: Matt. x, 1, "he called *unto him* *his* twelve disciples"; and "*unto*" need not be put in italics, for it is in the compound middle verb; Romans xi, 4, "*the image of Baal*," the italicized words being quite needless; and in Psalms cxxxvii, 5, "*her cunning*" is an explanation.

According to the statement of the English deputies at the Synod of Dort, the Headings were made by command. The

last or seventh rule which they enumerated, was that "new arguments should be prefixed to each book, and new contents to each chapter."¹ The headings or contents of the chapters are interesting, and their quaint language has been glanced at. But some are manifestly wrong: 2 Sam. xxiv, "eleven thousand fighting men," for "thirteen hundred thousand"; 1 Cor. v, "human offenders to be shamed," instead of "shunned." Some of them, instead of being a brief index, are a commentary, which is occasionally doubtful, and at other times wrong. Luke vii, the woman that was a sinner is called Mary Magdalene, Gen. xxxii, 24, Jacob wrestleth with "an angel," but "a man" is the language of the text. Similarly, Gen. xviii, Abraham entertaineth three "angels," three "men" being the phrase in the text; Ps. cxxvii, "Good children are his gift," but the text has no allusion to their character; Acts vi, "appoint the office of deaconship to seven chosen men," but the office is not so named in the text; Acts vii, 44, "ceremonies to last but for a time." The prophecies are usually expounded, as in Deut. xviii, Christ the prophet; Psalms ii, the kingdom of Christ; Isaiah ii, iv, and in many other places; nay, "his Substitution" occurs in Isaiah xxii, by a far-fetched exegesis. In like manner, the church is often set forth as a distinct application of prophecy. The headings of the Song of Solomon are a continuous commentary, Christ and the church being prefixed to every chapter. The edition of Matthew or Rogers had set the example in 1537.¹ Such commentary goes far beyond translation, and intrudes into a forbidden province. There is also a peculiar comment on 1 Tim. ii, 15, and there is a long note in the heading of 1 John i, whether true or false. Surely the phrase Ps. cxii is more than the psalm warrants, "Godliness hath the promise of this life and of the life to come." Yet those who made these summaries must have acted under some restraint, for in spite of temptation to expound, they give at Num. xxiv, "He prophesieth of the star of Jacob," and they do not uniformly spiritualize in the Song, but say once with a hybrid application, "Christ directeth her to the shepherds' tents." There is no proof that Nimrod was "the first monarch,"

¹ See vol. I, p. 329.

as stated in Gen. x. It is one thing that the text, 2 Kings xx, speaks of "the shadow" returning backwards ten degrees, but quite another thing that the summary says, "the sun goeth ten degrees backward," though the language occurs in Isaiah xxxviii. At Rev. xxii it is said, "nothing may be added to the word of God nor taken therefrom," but the text speaks only of "the book of this prophecy," that is, the Apocalypse. One heading is of a peculiar character, Ps. cxlix, "the prophet exhorteth to praise God for his love to the church, and for that power which he hath given to the church to rule the consciences of men." But by and by it ended at the first clause, "love to the church." One edition of 1649 with Genevan notes makes the last clause "power . . . for the conversion of sinners." Blayney changed the heading into "that power which he hath given to his saints," and it is found sometimes more briefly "the prophet exhorteth to praise God."

So vague was the information on some of these points, that in the Committee of the House of Commons, appointed to examine into the Queen's printer's patent, and which sat in 1860, it was asked of one person examined before it, "If the Authorized Version in Scotland was the same as that in England?" The Chairman put the question, "Was it not in the year 1680 that the italics were first introduced?"—Answer: "I do not know." "Do you know with what object they were introduced?" A well-known publisher could not tell the year in which the Authorized Version was first published. Another witness, "a prophet and a prophet's son," used these words, "The Conference at Hampton Court, usually called the Savoy Conference," and apparently no one corrected him.

CHAPTER XLVIII.

THE printing of the Bible seems up till 1576 to have been open to any who could obtain a royal license. Wilkes, Queen Elizabeth's ambassador to France, Holland, and Germany, enjoyed for some time the privilege of being "her Majesty's printer of the English language." This patent was sold in part to John Jugge, the son of the printer of the Bishops' Bible, amidst the protests of 175 members of the Stationers' Company, and of 185 dealers in books. Another patent, more extensive, was sold by Wilkes in 1579 to Christopher Barker for a "great sum." In 1589 Christopher Barker obtained a direct patent for himself and his son Robert who outlived him forty-six years, and died an imprisoned debtor. This patent embraced "all Bibles and Testaments whatever in the English tongue, with notes or without notes, printed before then or afterwards to be printed by our command." Robert Barker obtained in 1612 a patent for his eldest son Christopher, to be held after his father's death; but this son dying in 1617, the patent, to last for thirty years, was transferred to the second son Robert. The Barkers then assigned their right to Bonham Norton and John Bill; and in 1635 Robert Barker paid £600 for the patent already enjoyed by his two elder sons, to be held in reversion by his younger sons, Charles and Matthew. The Barkers thus held the patent virtually till 1709, a period of 130 years, when the Basketts got it and kept it for 90 years or till 1799, the last thirty years of this term being assigned, however, to Charles Eyre and his heirs for £10,000. Eyre took possession in 1769, and assumed William Strahan

as partner, and the patent came in course of time into the hands of the present possessors, Eyre & Spottiswoode.¹

As told on page 33, Barker had been in the service of Walsingham and had his patron's crest, a tiger's head, over his shop in Paternoster Row; and the same symbol occurs in the initial letter of Psalm cxii, in the edition of 1611, and similarly at Psalms xxxv, cxii, cxiii, in the edition of 1617. The Barkers honoured Cecil, also, in a similar way, by inserting his arms in capital letters in their Bibles, as in the initial B, of Psalm i, of the editions of 1634 and 1640.

But as the patent descended through these years there were various changes in the names appearing on the title-page of the Bible, and though only one date is given in the following clauses, the same names usually continued for several years. In 1620 the printers are Robert Barker & John Bill; in 1631, Robert Barker & the Assignees of John Bill; in 1666, John Bill & Christopher Barker; in 1679, John Bill, Thomas Newcomb, & Henry Hills; in 1690, Charles Bill & the Executrix of Thomas Newcomb; in 1728, John Baskett & the Assigns of Henry Hills; in 1769, Thomas Baskett & the Assigns of Robert Baskett; in 1806, George Eyre & Andrew Strahan.

> The Universities at the same time had their own printers.

It is a gross but a natural mistake to imagine that these patents were given to secure correct and careful printing. They are simply a royal gift to a public servant or a favourite, with or without a pecuniary return. They contain no injunction as to correctness, and provide no penalty for inaccuracy.

The following pages are not meant to present a systematic Bibliography; only a very few distinctive editions of the English Bible are noticed, so that we do not stir the question as to the names that ought to be given to certain forms and sizes of the volumes. A description of various lists of English Bibles (Tutet, Ducarel, and Ames being included), may be found in Cotton's preface to his "Editions of the English Bible." The long list published by Lea Wilson contains only the copies in his own library; and though he got

¹ Report of a Select Committee of the House of Commons, 1860.

into confusion about the issues of 1611, he has given useful accounts of many editions. Loftie's "Century of Bibles" contains much interesting information; and in his Appendix he has printed a list of the copies of the Authorized Version in the British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, in the Library of Canterbury Cathedral, in that of Mr. Francis Fry of Bristol, and in the Royal Library at Stuttgart. The large collection of Bibles belonging to the late Mr. Euing, of Glasgow, has been bequeathed by him to the library of the University.

The revised copy or copies of the Bishops' Bible used at press have not been preserved. A volume in the Bodleian Library, an edition of 1602, with corrections, has been sometimes taken for one of them; but Canon Westcott clearly proves the incorrectness of the opinion, from the nature of the marks and notes. Kilburne's Tract,¹ published in 1659, contains this curious protest, that the printing of Bibles should "not be solely appropriated to Mr. Hill and Mr. Field, on pretence of their purchasing the translated copy made in anno 1611, and unduly entering it lately as their private copy, and for their sole property in the Stationers' Register." It seems to be beyond doubt that the revisers wrought upon a copy of the edition of 1602, a reprint of that of 1572, and certainly not upon a copy of the first edition of 1568, as has been sometimes conjectured.

It might be anticipated that a patentee would at a new epoch endeavour to produce an immaculate edition, as he had no fear of rivalry, and could command his own price. But the result has been far otherwise. Barker looked, however, to the sale and dispersion of the first editions, for there were two competitors in the market. It was meant to succeed and supplant the Bishops', of which it was a professed revision, and

¹ Kilburne's Tract has been reprinted by Mr. Loftie in his Century of Bibles, London, 1872. The title of the Tract, a copy of which is in the British Museum, is "Dangerous Errors in several late printed

Bibles; to the great scandal and corruption of sound and true religion. Discovered by William Kilburne, Gent. Printed at Finsbury, anno 1659.

the change was speedily and easily effected. The two books were brought into artistic correspondence by the employment in King James' Bible of the same head pieces, woodcuts, and other embellishments, which had appeared in the Bishops'. The figure of Neptune with his trident and horses, which appears so often in the Bishops', stands at the beginning of Matthew. The figure wants freshness, for the cut had not even been touched up for its present position. But the Genevan was a more formidable rival; and the new Bible was also made to correspond externally in many ways with this older and very popular version. The title-page of the smaller editions of 1612-1613 is a facsimile in its ornamentation of that so often found in copies of the Genevan, the title being in the heart-shaped oval, with the twelve tribes and the twelve apostles in the margin. The quarto Bibles and the octavo New Testaments had usually this plate.¹ The issue of 1616, the first folio in Roman letter, appropriated a design already used in the Bishops', the arms of James being substituted for those of Elizabeth, and the dragon giving way to the unicorn. Before the year 1640, Barker and his successors had issued fifty editions, five in goodly black letter folio in 1611, -13, -17, -34, -40. By this time also two editions had also been published in Edinburgh, and ten at Cambridge.

But the printing itself is from the beginning marked by many serious blunders, and those who saw the first edition through the press did not exercise a strict and continuous supervision. What are called the first and second issues² of 1611 are disfigured by many errors. A portion of a verse is printed twice in the one issue, Exodus xiv, 10. "Judas" stands for "Jesus"³ in the other (Matt. xxvi, 36), with Christ spelled "Chkist,"

¹ Cotton says that the latest Geneva Bible he had seen was one of 1644, printed at Amsterdam. It might have been stated on a previous occasion that Andrewes, one of the translators and the director of the Westminster Old Testament Company, usually took his text from the

Genevan, and as often after 1611 as before it.

² See page 202.

³ When a copy came into my possession, it had a slip with "Jesus" printed on it very neatly pasted over "Judas."

and "oe" for "of" in the Dedication, while in the list of books 1 and 2 Chronicles are put down as 1 and 2 Corinthians. Exodus ix, 13, reads, "Let my people go that they may serve thee," for "serve me." The following are a sample of misprints in what has been commonly called the first issue: Gen. x, 16, "Emorite" for "Amorite"; Exodus xxxviii, 11, "hoops" for "hooks"; Lev. xiii, 56, "the plaine be" for "the plague be"; xvii, 14, "ye shall not eat" for "ye shall eat"; Ezra iii, 5, the word "offered" is repeated. Isaiah xlix, 20, "the place is too straight" for "strait," though the first is an older form of spelling; Jer. xxii, 3, "deliver the spoiler" for "the spoiled"; l, 29, "she hath done unto her" for "she hath done, do unto her"; Ezek. vi, 8, "that he may have" for "ye may have"; xxiv, 7, "poured it" for "poured it not"; Hosea vi, 5, "shewed them" for "hewed them"; Mal. i, 8, "if he offer" for "if ye offer"; Matt. vi, 3, "right" for "right hand"; viii, 25, "awoke" for "awoke him"; xvi, 25, "his" is repeated; 1 Cor. xiv, 23, "come together into some place," but rightly given in xi, 20, "into one place." The headline 2 Chron. xxix is printed xxxix, and the headline Micah iv is printed "Joel"; Gen. xvii, heading Isaac is spelled "Izsaac." On the top of the column containing the portion of 1 Esdras iv, Apocrypha is printed > Anocrypha. For its errors and inconsistencies the first edition cannot, therefore, be regarded as a standard edition. There are also capricious irregularities in the printing of the supplemental words. The edition of 1613 is still worse, for though it corrects some errors of the first issues, it has many of its own; Lev. vii, 25, "the fast of the beast" for "the fat of the beast"; xix, 10, "shall glean" for "shall not glean"; xxvi, 24, "wake contrary" for "walk contrary"; Deut. xix, 5, "slippeth from the helm" for "the helve"; 1 Sam. x, 16, "water" for "matter"; 2 Kings xxii, 3, "were" for "year"; 2 Chron. vi, 10, "in the throne of David" for "in the room of David"; Neh. x, 31, "we would not leave" for "we would leave"; Job xxix, 3, "shined through darkness" for "walked through darkness"; Isaiah lix, 7, "shed bleed" for "shed innocent blood"; Ezek. xxiii, 7, "she delighted herself" for "she defiled herself"; Dan. iv, 13, "a watcher holy and an one" for "a

watcher and an holy one"; 1 Cor. xi, 17, "I praise you" for "I praise you not"; 2 Cor. ii, 8, "continue your love" for "confirm your love." There are several clauses and verses omitted altogether, as 1 Kings iii, 15, the clause "and offered peace offerings"; Hab. ii, 5, "nations, and heapeth unto him all"; Matt. xiii, 8, "and some sixtyfold"; xvi, 11, "I spake it not to you concerning bread, that"; John xx, 25, "put my finger into the prints of the nails"; and verses 13 and 14 in Ecclesiasticus xvi are also left out. In fact, between the edition of 1611 and that of 1613 there are more than three hundred variations, and such differences as the following occur in the headings, in 1611, 2 Sam. xxiv, eleven thousand, but in 1613 thirteen hundred thousand; in the one edition, "Haggai promiseth God's assistance," but in 1613, "promiseth God, assistance." Some of the changes look like attempted improvements, as Gen. xxvii, 44, "fury pass away" for "turn away"; Mark ix, 24, "help my unbelief" for "help thou mine unbelief"; John v, 3, "a great company" for "a great multitude." In the edition of 1634, there is an important change which has kept its ground. Heb. xii, 1, "let us runne with patience the race set before us," the issues of 1611, -13, -17 having "let us runne with patience unto the race," the Great Bible and the Bishops had "into the battayle." One deviation occurred very early: Ruth iii, 15, "and she went into the city," "he" being in the so-called first issue, but "she," a mistranslation, found its way into the second, and kept its place in both the folio and smaller edition of 1613. "She" is preferred by Jerome, but the Hebrew verb is masculine. A similar variation occurs in the Song of Solomon ii, 7; iii, 5; viii, 4, "till she please" being the rendering in the first place, but "till he please" being the rendering in the second and third places, while the same Hebrew is found in all the instances. In the second issue "till he please" is the uniform rendering. The first New Testament in 12mo, black letter, appeared in 1611, and is now in the collection of Mr. Lenox of New York. The first quarto edition of the Bible in Roman letter has the date of 1612, and has in it several of the errors already specified in the issues of 1611. The names

of Bonham Norton and John Bill appear first on a quarto edition of 1619. In an edition printed by Barker & Bill in 1631, the "not" was left out in the Seventh Commandment, Exod. xx, 14, and it stood, "Thou shalt commit adultery."¹ The printer was fined £300 by Laud, the money being used to purchase a fount of Greek types for the use of the Universities. It would take a goodly volume to contain the misprints of the various editions. There are also many variations from the issues of 1611. Rom. xii, 2, "what is that good, that acceptable, and perfect will of God," passed into the present more literal reading in 1629. In the same way "helps in government," 1 Cor. xii, 28, became in the same year, more correctly, "helps, governments"; "approved to death," 1 Cor. iv, 9; became "appointed to death" as early as 1616; and the clause "hath not the Son," 1 John v, 12, had the "of God" rightly added, according to the original text. "Drusilla which was a Jew," Acts xxiv, 24, became in 1629 "which was a Jewess," as in Acts xvi, 1. In 1 Tim. i, 4, "godly" was inserted before "edifying" as early as 1633; and in 1 Cor. iv, 13, "world" of the early editions was turned into "earth" in an edition of 1806.

A folio edition, London (Augustine Matthews), 1633, is a reprint of Fulkes' edition of 1589, the "Text of the New Testament," which had the Rheims version printed in the one column, and the Bishops' in the other; but in this edition the Authorized is substituted for the Bishops'.

The Cambridge edition of 1629 was revised with some care, and many necessary alterations were made, the editor being unknown. Yet out of this revision sprang an error which kept its place, in hosts of editions, for more than a hundred years—viz., "thy" for "the" in 1 Tim. iv, 16, "take heed to thy doctrine" for "the doctrine."

But the good example of 1629 was not followed. An edition in 12mo, professing to be by Barker and assigns of Bill, in 1638, abounds in errors. The following may be noted: Gen. xxxvii, 2, "Belial" for "Bilhah"; Num. xxv, 18, "wives" for "wiles"; xxvi, 10, "two thousand

¹ It has 1631 both on title and colophon.

and fifty" for "hundred and fifty"; 2 Sam. xxiii, 20, "slew two lions like men" for "lion like men"; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 14, "had polluted" for "had hallowed"; Nehem. iv, 9, "read our prayer" for "made our prayer"; Isa. i, 6, "purifying sores," for "putrefying sores"; xxix, 13, "taught by the people" for "taught by the precept"; xlix, 22, "their sons" for "thy sons"; Ezek. v, 11, "any piety" for "any pity"; Luke vii, 47, "her sins which are many are forgotten" for "forgiven"; xix, 29, "ten of his disciples" for "two"; John xviii, 29, "Pilate went not" for "went out"; 1 Cor. vii, 34, "praise her husband" for "please"; 1 Tim. ii, 9, "shamefulness" for "shamefacedness"; iv, 16, "thy" for "the" doctrine.¹

The first edition avowedly printed abroad appeared in 1642 folio (Joost Broerss, Amsterdam), and it was furnished with the Genevan notes. Another and similar edition was published in the same place in 1683, as the maps have engraven on them "At Amsterdam, by Nicolaus Visscher, with privilege of the Lords the States Generall," and, as some suppose, it was printed probably by Swartz or his widow. In 1645 were published two editions "according to the copy printed by Roger Daniel," and a third issue, in 12mo, by Joachim Nosche, dwelling upon the Sea Dijk.

In 1638 appeared the famous folio of Buck & Daniel. The edition of 1611 was thoroughly revised by such scholars as Ward, Goad, Boyse, and Mead, &c. This revision, said to have been made by royal command, was much needed. Greater consistency was secured in the printing of the italic words, and many useful changes were introduced; so that it was regarded as the "authentique corrected Bible." Yet, with all the earnest care and labour given to this issue, there began in

¹ This edition is referred to by Baillie in his "Opus Historicum et Chronologicum," p. 55, Amstelodami, 1663. Baillie says that the edition was printed at Amsterdam, and was one among many sent across from Holland, all of them abounding in blunders. Kilburne says of these Bibles, in the Tract referred to, that though dated 1638, they were imported in 1656, adding "wherein Mr. Kiffin and Mr. Hills cannot be excused, being contrary to the several Acts of Parliament of 20th Sept., 1649, and 7th Jany., 1652, for regulating of printing."

it an error which lived for half a century—viz., the printing of “ye” for “we”—“whom ye may appoint,” Acts vi, 3. The Independents were blamed for making the change, to favour their own polity. But they had no power in 1638 to secure such an alteration, for Laud was still primate, and also a visitor of the University of Cambridge. As the error appeared also in two Scottish editions of 1673 and 1675, a similar charge was made against Presbyterians, that they “handled the Word of God deceitfully.”¹ The accusation must have been made in ignorance of what Presbyterian administration really is, for it has never dreamed of assigning to the laity the power of ordination. Presbyterians were utterly powerless in those years; but the General Assembly felt hurt by the insinuation, and at their meeting in January, 1698, they solemnly declared that they do not “own any other reading of that text, but ‘whom we may appoint.’” Mr. Loftie speaks of the misprint as being “found in many Bibles supposed to be printed for the Puritans.” What editions are those which are so specified—for the misprint was apparently in the great majority of editions? Did any disciple of Owen, or any intelligent Congregationalist, ever base an argument on the misprint? It is notable, too, that in an edition of 1649, furnished with Genevan Notes, and therefore favoured by Puritans, the reading is correct.

This fine folio was highly coveted. Sir Matthew Hale, the Chief Justice, in his will left Richard Baxter “forty shillings as a token of his love.” Baxter records,² “I purchased the largest Cambridge Bible, and put his picture before it, as a monument to my house. But waiting for my own death, I gave it Sir William Ellis, who laid out about ten pounds to put it into a more curious cover, and keep it for a monument in his honour.” A shrewd observer of manners and habits tells of a lady in Edinburgh who had fallen into poorer circumstances, and lived in a room “on the head of the highest stair in the Covenant Close,”—that “she never read a chapter except out of a Cambridge Bible, printed by Daniel, and bound in embroidered velvet.”³

¹ The accuser was Mr. Gipps, Recorder of Bury.

² Baxter's Works, vol. I, p. 337.

³ Scott, in Redgauntlet.

A 12mo edition of 1653 is sometimes called the Quaker's Bible, for no other apparent reason than that the publisher, Giles Calvert, printed for many Friends. But some Friends at a later season did contemplate an edition for themselves, so remodelled as to be fitted “for audible and social reading.” The Pentateuch alone was published. York, 1835. An octavo edition of 1655 (E. T. “for a Society of Stationers”), has the honour of being correct in the two places where so many issues blundered, having “we” in Acts vi, 3, and “the” in 1 Tim. iv, 16.

At an early period, good people became alarmed by the number and variety of the readings, and in 1644 some members of the Westminster Assembly complained to the House of Commons, “that there were errors and corruptions in diverse Bibles of an impression from beyond the seas, and they prayed the House to suppress the circulation of them.”¹ The result was that foreign Bibles were not to be sold or circulated till they had been “passed and allowed” by the Assembly of Divines. In 1656, the “Grand Committee for Religion” took into consideration an edition by Field, 1653, especially an impression in 24mo of which he had sold 2,000 copies, and they got into their possession no less than 7,900 copies. Kilburne in his Tract stigmatizes the impressions of Henry Hill and John Field, particularly Field's edition of 1656, as containing 91 notorious faults, 2 Cor. xiii, 6, being omitted altogether.²

¹ Christopher Ravius, in the preface to *Prima Pars Alcorani Arabico-Latini*, Amsterdam, 1646, states without hesitation that an English printer had within the last five years sent out from his press not fewer than 40,000 copies of the English Bible, that his last edition consisted of 12,500 copies, and that in the same city as many as 150,000 English Bibles had been printed.

² Such errors are in the various editions, as Gen. xxxvi, 24, “rulers

in the wilderness” for “mules”; Ruth iv, 13, “corruption” for “conception”; Luke xxi, 28, “condemnation” for “redemption”; the omission of a clause in John xi, 21; “the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of God,” in 1 Cor. vi, 9; “instruments of righteousness for sin,” Rom. vi, 13; John v, 23, “Bethsaida” for “Bethesda”; “their flesh” for “fish.” An edition by Mr. Robinson, “a Scotch Rabbi,” is condemned as having 2,000 faults,

Kilburne asserts: "Moreover during the time of the late parliament, great numbers of Bibles, in a large 12mo volume, were imported from Holland in 1656 with this false title, Imprinted at London by Rob. Barker, &c., anno 1638, wherein Mr. Kiffin and Mr. Hills cannot be excused (if reports be true), being contrary to the several Acts of Parliament of 20th September, 1649, and 7th January, 1652, for regulating of printing. Wherein are so many notorious Erratas, false English, Nonsense, and Corruptions, that in reading part of Genesis I found 80 grand faults, as chap. xxvii, 16, 'mouth of his neck' for 'smoother of his neck'; chap. xxix, 13, 'she' for 'he ran to meet him'; chap. xxx, 40, 'put them unto' for 'put them not unto Laban's cattle.' And in reading Ecclesiastes, Canticles, and the first twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah, I found almost an hundred gross faults, which I did specifie to the Parliament, and therefore omit them here. The very importation of the books being an offence contrary to the said Statutes and ought deservedly to be suppressed; which notwithstanding are dispersed in the country as aforesaid." And he thus concludes: "That it will graciously please his divine Majesty of his infinite goodness, and mercy, to bless this Common-wealth with the like dispensation of his blessed Word in our proper Dialect, and speech as it is in the original Idioms, by the Zeal and Patronage of his Highness, and the Parliament. And that for the private Emolument of any persons (how great soever), the Scriptures may not be hereafter carelessly and erroneously printed, whereby to save the charge of good Correction and Printing, as may be plainly proved by such Bibles, which have been printed in late years, or else (as is pretended) the profit will not countervail the charge. For, as it is credibly reported, Mr. Hills and Mr. Fields have several times affirmed, that they are engaged to pay £500 per Annum

besides base paper and printing.— Luke xxii, 34, "I tell thee, Philip," "loves" for "loaves," "ram" for "Peter," predicting the denial. "lamb," "good" for "god," "mount" In a Cambridge Bible of 1816 "sun" for "smooth." Six thousand errors is given as "son" in the phrase "Sun are said to be in one edition. of righteousness," Mal. iv, 2.

As late as 1792, an Oxford copy has,

to some, whose names out of respect to them I forbear to mention, over and above £100 per Annum to Mr. Marchamont Needham, and his wife, out of the profits of the sale of their Bibles, deriding, insulting, and triumphing over others of the Printing Myserie, out of their confidence in their great Friends and purse, as it is said, as if they were lawlesse, and free (notwithstanding the truth of the premises and other grand enormities often committed by them) both from offence and punishment, to the great dishonour of the Common-wealth in general, and dammage of many private persons in particular."

During the Commonwealth, very many editions bear on the title-page "London Company of Stationers," and many after 1675 are dated "Oxford at the Theater." Those last copies were sold in London by various booksellers. The colophon of one edition has, "Printed at the Theater in Oxford, and are to be sold by Moses Pitt, at the Angel in St. Paul's Churchyard; John Parker, at the Leg and Star over against the Exchange in Cornhill; Thomas Guy, at the corner of Little Lombard Street; and William Leake, at the Crown in Fleet Street." Many copies were disposed of by Thomas Guy, who also imported Bibles from the Continent, and left his fortune to build the great Hospital that bears his name. The story about Field's Pearl Bible, as told by Isaac Disraeli, is exaggerated, and the errors are at once ascribed by him to the wilful perversions and malignity of the "Sectarists." One specimen may suffice. His words are, "It is said that Field received a present of £1,500 from the Independents to corrupt a text in Acts vi, 3, the corruption being the easiest possible, to put a *ye* instead of a *we*."¹ But Field had nothing to do with the error, for it had appeared fifteen years before, and is first found, as we have seen, in the Cambridge folio of 1638, revised by divines of the Church of England, at a time, too, when Disraeli's idol, King Charles I, was upon the throne.

As late as the period of the Commonwealth, there was still a hankering after notes, similar to the Genevan ones. "Divers of the printers and stationers of London were induced to petition the Committee of the House of Commons for license to print

¹ Curiosities of Literature, vol. III, p. 427, London, 1858.

thing as this, and of so great import, should do as first ignorance, and then superstition, hath done before them. It is true, indeed, that they have refused these books out of the canon, but they have reserved them still in the Bible, as if God should have cast Adam out of the state of happiness, and yet have continued him in the place of happiness. Not to insist upon this, which is some digression, you know the counsel of Sarah concerning Ishmael, and in that she outstripped Abraham in the spirit of prophecy, 'Cast out the bond-woman and her son; for the son of the bond-woman may not be heir with the son of the free.'"¹

Many members of the Church of England may have been of Lightfoot's opinion, but the Puritans were more decided, Tyndale had translated some portions of the Apocrypha to serve as church lessons. Coverdale accepted it, Rogers admitted it under a species of protest, the Great Bible and the Bishops' had it, and the Genevan copies usually included it. With all its absurdities, fables, and inconsistencies, it exhibits a great body of Jewish thought and theology, which may be faintly traced either in idea, imagery, or diction, in a few parts of the New Testament. It was about this time that Bibles were printed having the canonical books only. When, in 1645, a Book of Prayers was compiled for the navy, the Apocrypha was ignored. At the prosecution, as early as 1633, before the Star Chamber, of the Recorder of Salisbury, for breaking some painted glass in a church, Chief-Justice Richardson threw in a word in favour of the defendant: "I have been long acquainted with him, he sitteth by me sometimes at church, he brought a Bible to church with him (I have seen it), with the Apocrypha and Common Prayer Book in it, not of the new cut."²

There was a heavy folio on large paper published in 1660-59 (Field, Cambridge), of which Pepys records, in his Diary, 27th May, 1667, "There came Richardson the bookbinder, with one

¹ Works, vol. VI, p. 130, ed. Erubhin or Miscellanies, Works, vol. Pitman, London, 1822. Similar IV, p. 30.

remarks may be found in his ² Campbell's Chief Justices, vol. curious and interesting treatise, II, p. 17.

of Ogilby's Bibles in quires, for me to see and buy . . . but it is like to be so big that I shall not use it." An edition of 1682 (Bill, Newcomb, & Hills), has errors on nearly every page—errors like the following: Gen. ix, 5, "at the hand of man," omitted; xxi, 26, "neither didst thou tell me," omitted; xxx, 35, "and all the brown among the sheep," omitted; Deut. xxiv, 3, "if the latter husband ate her," for "hate her"; Esther vi, 2, "kings," for "keepers"; Jerem. xiii, 27, "adversaries" for "adulteries"; xvi, 6, "glad" for "bald"; xviii, 21, "swine," for "famine"; Ezek. xviii, 25, "the way of the Lord is equal," for "not equal."

A folio edition of becoming appearance was published in 1701, under the patronage of Archbishop Tenison; London, C. Bill, and the executrix of T. Newcomb. It was graced with chronological notes and a collection of parallel passages, by Dr. Lloyd, Bishop of Worcester; a table of measures, weights, and coins being added by Dr. Cumberland, Bishop of Peterborough. The margin also noted the connection of the passages with the Book of Common Prayer. But this edition, like so many of its predecessors, was disfigured by inaccurate printing—by what Lewis calls "typographical erratas." Lewis writes, "Two years afterwards, in 1703, the Lower House of Convocation took up the subject and presented to the Upper House a humble representation of several gross errors in late editions of the Holy Bible." But no record of such transactions survives. It would seem that the privileged presses were very careless, for their patent lifted them above all fear of competition.

The edition of Dr. Paris, Cambridge, 1762, though it embodied "large corrections in the particulars," left many places untouched where change was necessary, those changes being introduced, not on his own judgment singly, but after an examination by a "Select Committee," particularly the Principal of Hertford College and Professor Wheeler. Errors, however, crept in, especially in the margin and in the italics. This edition, which was nearly all destroyed by a fire, was far from being immaculate, and several of its errors were repeated in the more famous edition of Dr. Blayney.

The edition of Dr. Blayney (Oxford, Wright & Gill,

1769) has been long regarded as a standard edition. The editor bestowed uncommon pains upon it. He collated the original edition of 1611, that of Bishop Lloyd, 1701, and two Cambridge editions in quarto and octavo, and discovered and corrected many errors, "so that the text is reformed to such a standard of purity as it is presumed is not to be met with in any other edition hitherto extant." The punctuation was also carefully attended to as to correctness and uniformity, and the labours of Dr. Paris on the italic words were largely supplemented. Alterations were made on the heads or contents of the chapters and the running titles of each page; and "the meaning of those proper names, to the etymology of which there is allusion in the text, were supplied in the margin." Immense pains were bestowed on the marginal references, which had been erroneously printed in so many editions. In some few instances Dr. Blayney confesses himself to have been "at a loss in finding out the true reference, though the corruption was manifest in the want of any the most distant resemblance between the passages compared together." These references were cautiously examined, particularly those of Bishop Lloyd's Bible and of a Scotch edition, and were also greatly augmented, the purpose being to make the collection "useful in the light of a concordance, material as well as verbal, always at hand." The quarto copy so prepared was first sent to press, and first, second, and, "generally speaking," third proofs were read, besides frequent revisions—"a very tiresome and tedious task, but not more than was absolutely necessary, in order to attain the degree of accuracy that was wished." The figures belonging to the marginal references, "where errors were perpetually creeping in," were minutely superintended. When the quarto sheets were printed off the forms were lengthened out for the folio edition, but the change so disarranged the references and chronology that a fresh collation of the whole with the quarto edition was gone through, and in this process "some few trivial inaccuracies" have been discovered and rectified, "so that the folio edition is rendered by this somewhat the more perfect of the two, and therefore more fit to be recommended for a standard copy." New references

to the amount of 30,495 were inserted in the margin. "The whole was completed in a course of between three and four years' application." Honest and anxious labour was expended on the edition, and yet it turned out to be far from immaculate. For when it was collated for Eyre & Strahan's edition of 1806, not fewer than 116 errors were discovered in it. One of these consists of the omission of a whole clause in Rev. xviii, 22, "at all in thee, and no craftsman of whatever craft he be shall be found any more." Cotton says that the omission occurs only in the quarto edition; and Hartwell Horne, in some earlier editions of his Introduction, says that the omission arose from the overrunning when the volume was changed from a folio to a quarto form. But the error occurs both in the folio and quarto; and according to Dr. Blayney's own report the quarto was the original form of the edition.¹ Principal Lee justly questions the perfect accuracy of the report of the collators for the edition of 1806 in their enumeration of only 116 errors said to be found in the copies of 1769, and he adds that even in this edition of 1806 there are also such blunders as "holy" for "whole," &c. In Blayney's edition these blunders are found: Gen. xlix, 26, "thy progenitors," for "my progenitors"; Deut. xi, 19, "thy earth," for "the earth"; Judges xi, 7, "children," for "elders"; 2 Kings xxiii, 21, "this book of the covenant," for "the book of this covenant"; 1 Chron. xxix, 6, "over the kings," for "of the kings"; John xxi, 17, "he saith," for "he said"; Rom. vii, 20, "now if do," for "if I do"; 1 Cor. iv, 13, "earth," for "world"; 2 Cor. xii, 2, "about," for "above"; 1 John i, 4, "our joy," for "your joy"; and "godly" omitted in the clause, 1 Tim. i, 4. Other variations might be given, but these are sufficient to destroy the plea of perfection. An edition of 1811 has in Isaiah lvii, 12, "thy works, for they shall profit thee," "not" being omitted. Eyre & Strahan's quarto edition of 1813 was recommended to the Protestant Epis-

¹ Dr. Blayney's Report, dated Hertford College, October 25, 1769, is inserted in the Gentleman's Magazine for November, 1769.

Chancellor and the other Delegates

copal Church of the United States of America by its Convention; but it is by no means faultless, for it has, 2 Cor. xii, 2, "about" for "above"; Eph. iv, 16, "holy body," for "whole body." The blunder, "three is but one God," occurs in three editions of Eyre & Strahan, in 1812, 1820, 1822.

Erroneous printing and bad paper were still subjects of complaint, and George I, April 24, 1724, issued an order to the patentees, "that they shall employ such correctors of the press and allow them such salaries as shall be approved from time to time by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London for the time being."

There seems to have been a scanty issue of Bibles of smaller size, and Lemoine, a bookseller in London, published in 1797 the following complaint: "Neither the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, nor the King's Printers at London, have distinguished themselves for their typographical exertions in publishing a pocket Bible; an article very much wanted. The Cambridge Bible in 24to is too thick; the London Bible is upon bad paper; and nothing can be said in favour of the Oxford pocket Bible." The same author says elsewhere, speaking of editions undertaken by private individuals, "The emulation produced, and the consequence of the exercise of the liberal arts, has never manifested itself more of late years than in this article of Bible printing; while the two Universities and the King's Printers have brought out nothing above mediocrity. It would have reflected honour upon their privileges and patents, had they exerted their superiority, and not left it to individuals to excel them in their own province."¹

A quarto edition appeared in 1810 with "short notes by several learned and pious Reformers,"—virtually the Genevan notes; hence afterwards called the "Reformers' Bible."

Complaints sprang up anew in the year 1830 as to the unsatisfactory state of the text of the English Bible, and a committee of Dissenting ministers published resolutions on the

¹ History of Printing, p. 148, London, 1797.

subject, declaring that "extensive alterations had been introduced into the text of our Authorized Version"; branding these alterations in unmeasured terms and foreboding dismal results.¹ As the question, after all, was one chiefly about the use of the words printed in italics, Dr. Turtton² disposed of it in easy style, and showed fully the capricious use of italics in the first edition of 1611. "The translators produced a standard version, but the printers have not transmitted a standard text." In connection with this controversy there was published at Oxford in 1833 an exact copy of the first edition of 1611—"page for page and letter for letter"—retaining throughout the ancient mode of spelling and punctuation, and even the most manifest errors of the press. A collation of the edition of 1611 with that of 1613 is added. The report of an American committee, who prepared an unsuccessful edition in 1856 for the American Bible Society, avers that "in six copies compared the number of variations in text and punctuation falls but little short of twenty-four thousand."³ The volume, which was carefully prepared, was not accepted by the American public for various reasons. The Bible Society was justly accused of going beyond its proper province which was simply the circulation of the Scriptures. The revision was felt to be unworthy of the name, for it touched the text only in the smaller matters of spelling, italics, punctuation, and capital letters. The removal of the old theological headings and contents of chapters, as in Psalms and the Song of Solomon, led also to a grievous outcry, in which many men of high standing seem to have joined. The edition, therefore,

¹ Curtis, On the Existing Monopoly, accuracy will be found in the four letters to the Bishop of London, examination of various parties before &c., London, 1833. a committee of the House of Commons in 1832, 1837, 1860. Printers and publishers showed special sharpness in detecting errors in their rivals' editions, offering a remarkable illustration of the saying in Prov. xviii, 17. For the so-called Vinegar Bible see note, page 15.

² Text of the English Bible, Cambridge, 1833. Mr. Curtis's misrepresentations were also exposed by Edward Cardwell, D.D., Oxford, 1833.

³ Interesting information on the printing of Bibles and on the question of comparative expense and

wanting distinctive character, was soon withdrawn from circulation.¹

The marginal references grew and multiplied in the course of years. In the first edition of 1611 they amounted in the canonical books to 8,418, increasing to 23,895 in the edition of Hayes, Cambridge, 1677; to 33,000 in that of Scattergood, Cambridge, 1678; in Lloyd's to 39,466; in Blayney's to 64,983; in Crutwell's to 66,955, Bath, 1785. Such references to parallel passages became, therefore, unduly multiplied; especially in Canne's Bibles, which were long very popular, and his gauge seems to have been simply the capacity of the margin.

The punctuation has varied much in the numerous editions, and the stopping was heavy in the earlier issues. The connection, if connection there be, between the second and third verse of John i, depends on the punctuation adopted, and similarly in Matt. xix, 28, and Titus ii, 11. The full stop at the end of a verse sometimes interrupts the sense: Ps. lxxxiv, 5, 6, "in whose hearts are the ways of them, who passing through the valley of Baca make it a well"—with a simple comma after "them"—"those that dwell in His house are blessed, and those who make a pilgrimage to it." Luke xiii, 24, 25, "many will seek to enter in and shall not be able, when once the master of the house is risen up and hath shut to the door"—when the door is shut but not till then, is entrance impossible. Luke xxiii, 32, was printed thus, "and there were also two other malefactors led with him." This is the literal rendering, though there is a difference of reading. But "other" was then a plural form,² as in Gen. viii, 10, Matt. xiii, 8; "others" is never found in Shakespeare—the sense being that there were two other, or two besides him, they being malefactors. "Other" was by and by changed into "others" with a new punctuation. "And there were also two others, malefactors, led with him." The clause is liable still to be misunderstood. The reading of the Bishops' is, "and there

¹ Report of the Committee, New York, 1851. hand column of the first note on page 311.

² See the first line of the right

were other two evildoers led with him." The Great Bible cuts the knot by simply omitting the word "other," "and there were two evildoers led with him to be slain"—a version unfaithful to the Greek. The Rheims has, "and there were led also other two malefactors with him, to be executed."¹ The Geneva has "and there were two others, which were evildoers, led with him."

It is strange that there are no paragraph marks in the Authorized Version beyond the twentieth chapter of Acts, as if the printing had been hurried toward the conclusion. The division into chapters and verses is so familiar that it cannot be easily set aside—as Bibles in all languages adopt it, and all concordances are based upon it. That there are unfortunate breaks in the sense in several places no one questions. How could it be otherwise among 1,189 chapters and 31,173 verses. The matter contained in a paragraph might be brought more closely together without the hiatus of verses, or the verses might be marked in the margin.

It would serve no purpose to dwell on the splendid editions of Macklin or that of Baskerville for license to print which he is said to have paid a large sum to the University of Cambridge, or those of Bishop Wilson, Pine, Reeves, Heptinstall, and Bowyer, or to enumerate many others of recent years, superbly got up, with good paper, excellent printing, and many magnificent illustrations. A Cambridge Bible of 1858 may be for its general correctness pronounced a very good edition.

An edition was published in Dublin in 1714, and Dr. Cotton, Archdeacon of Cashel, confesses, "I am ashamed to say that this is the earliest edition of the Bible printed in Ireland, which I have been able to discover." The first New Testament published in America bears the imprint of Mark Baskett, London, 1742. But it was stealthily printed in Boston, and the issue consisted of 2,000 copies. A Bible was printed in the same place, with the same fictitious imprint to evade the patent, in 1752. But the Bible was first printed without disguise in America in 1782 (4to, Philadelphia, R. Arthur,

¹ "Alii duo nequam," Vulgate.

an emigrant Scotchman.)¹ This took place 162 years after the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers; and, strange to say, a Genevan Bible had been already published in 1743. The most thorough critical examination of the text of the Authorized, with a collation of the most famous editions, has been made by Dr. Scrivener, who is noted for his patient, minute, and accurate research, and his long and intimate familiarity with the subject. His Cambridge Paragraph Bible, 1873, bears witness on every page to the truth of our statement.

¹ Thomas's History of Printing in America, vol. I, pp. 93, 305. Arthur's daughter carried on the business after her father's death in 1802, and printed the First English Translation of the Septuagint—The Old Covenant, by Charles Thomson, late secretary to Congress, Philadelphia, Jane Arthur, 1808.

In mediæval times Bibles were often gorgeously appparelled, and adorned with gold and jewels. Charlemagne, in 795, gave the monks of St. Bertin the right of hunting in his forests, that they might have abundance of skins or leather with which to bind their books. Strange stories have been told of some thick and strongly bound Bibles, and their instrumentality in saving life—as when a musket ball struck against one hidden in the folds of a soldier's uniform, but was unable to pierce it through. The Pocket Bibles of Cromwell's soldiers were not meant

to serve such a purpose, though they were usually buttoned between the coat and the vest—over the heart. They consisted only of some extracts, divided into eighteen chapters, "which doe show the qualifications of the inner man that is a fit souldier to fight the Lord's battels, both before the fight, in the fight, and after the fight." London, 1643. Many of the sections are taken from the Genevan version, and the thin stitched book, printed on a single sheet folded in 16mo, bears on it, "Imprimatur *Edm. Calamy*." The only known copy in this country is in the British Museum, and it has been reprinted by Mr. Fry of Bristol. Another copy has been found in America. See Bibliomania in the Middle Ages, by F. Somner Merryweather, p. 152, London, 1849, and also The Bible in the Middle Ages, by Leicester Ambrose Buckingham, London, 1853.

CHAPTER XLIX.

IN the course of the story we have seen that hostility to a vernacular Bible was as intense in Scotland¹ as it was in England. The Scottish poets, like Lyndsay, often refer to English translators, and the enmity and terror which they created. According to George Buchanan, the clergy gave out that Luther had composed a book called the New Testament.² The priest Hamilton, whose virulent critical notes on the Genevan we have given on pp. 55, 56, is equal to his fellows: "Are all merchands, tailours, souters, baxters, wha cannot learne thair awin craftes without skilful maisters, ar thir, I say, and uther temporal men, of whatsomever vocation or degree, sufficient doctor of thame selfis to reid and understand the hie mysteries of the Bible?—What folie is it that wemen, wha cannot sew, cairde, nor spin, without they lerne the same of uther skilful wemen, suld usurp to reid and interpret the Bible?"

In spite of all hostility and jealous espionage, various versions found their way into the country, like the written

¹ See vol. I, p. 243.

² Halle, the old English Chronicler, p. 806 (ed. 1808), records under date 25th year of King Henry VIII, "This yere also, one Pavier, town clerk of London, hanged himself, which surely was a man that in no wise could abide to heere that the Gospel should be in Englishe, and I myself heard him once saie to me

and other that were by, swearing a great oath, that if he thought the kyngs highness would set forth the Scripture in Englishe, and let it be red of the people by his authoritie, rather than he would so long live he would cut his owne throte, but he brake promise, for as you heard he hanged himself."

Bible of Wycliffe and the volumes of Tyndale, and of the Genevan translation which it reprinted, but it never had any indigenous translation.¹ This strange negligence is the more unaccountable as there was no lack in Scotland of learned men, and no scarcity of books printed at home, or brought in from abroad—a traffic conducted under royal license. Readers were also abundant, and it is somewhat astonishing to find that in fifty-six years (namely, from 1558 to 1614), fourteen complete editions of the works of Sir David Lindsay were published, including two printed at Paris, and three in England. There were three editions of Buchanan's History, in 1582, 1583, 1584; and there were thirty-one editions of Buchanan's Psalms between 1566 and 1610, printed at Paris, London, and Antwerp, but not one in Scotland. Of the works of Principal Rollock who died in 1598, at least sixteen volumes were published before 1605; all of which passed rapidly through successive editions. The works of W. Guild, J. Abernethy, A. Symson, P. Symson, and others, passed through many editions between the year 1610 and 1633. During all this prolific time no complete edition of the Bible was printed in Scotland, and no edition of the New Testament, Psalms, or Catechism. As Principal Lee also asks, "If readers were not numerous, how is it that there were so many printers and so many booksellers in Edinburgh in the time of Queen Mary and James IV?"

Scotland was a poor country, and every one knows Sydney Smith's humorous translation of the Latin motto, first proposed for the Edinburgh Review, "*Tenui musam meditamur avena*," "We cultivate literature upon a little oatmeal." "This was too near the truth to be admitted," but it was the actual truth at a bygone time, when university students were in the habit of going about and begging their bread. An Act of Parliament of 1579, which threatens to punish various kinds of mendicants, adds with special emphasis, "all vagabound schollers of the Universites of Saint Andrewes, Glasgow, and Aberdene, not licensed by the Rector or Deane of Facultie of the Universitie to ask almes."² Yet Scotland, so poor was also proud, and was

¹ See p. 40.

² Dunlop's Parochial Law, p. 358.

characterized in periods before the Reformation by a rugged love of independence, and when her coveted freedom was in any way overborne, there was ever a strenuous kicking against the pricks. When Bruce took arms against the English power, many of the bishops patriotically sided with him, and the Abbot of Inchaffray officiated on the field of Bannockburn. The Scottish Church, too, was often restive under the Italian domination, and was again and again put under papal ban; but papal legates durst not advance beyond the border, and the Pope had his fingers often jagged by the Scottish thistle. The Reformation was a bold popular revolt in doctrine and jurisdiction. The Kirk, which was established in 1560, was sorely jealous of any encroachment on the part of the civil powers, as is seen in the following procedure: The Assembly held at Edinburgh, 1st July, 1568, in its third session, "ordained Thomas Bassandyne, printer, to call in the books printed be him intituled *the Fall of the Roman Kirk*, wherein the king is called *supreme head of the primitive kirk*, &c. and to keep the rest unsold till he alter the aforesaid title."

Yet all this cherished independence in church and kingdom did not suffice to produce a native translation of the Bible. Scotland was dependent for its Bibles on supplies from beyond itself. It imported the earlier versions from Holland, and especially from England. Tyndale's, the Genevan, and all the versions used, were made by Englishmen, belonging to a people to whom Scotland bore no good will, and it has meekly bowed its head to borrow the Bible and its other church books from its "auld enemie." Not only was its Bible prepared and published under King James, but its Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, are also importations from England, and were compiled there. Its Bible has thus been supplied from the English Church, and its Confession from the English Parliament which selected, paid, and controlled the divines of the Westminster Assembly, and sanctioned their work.¹ The Psalms, so commonly used in public worship, are

¹ Minutes of the Westminster Assembly. Edited by Professor Mitchell and Dr. Struthers. Introduction, Edinburgh, 1874.

English, too, in origin and authorship, having been twisted into rhyme by Francis Rouse, Provost of Eton, who sat in the Long Parliament, was Speaker of Cromwell's Little Parliament, and a member of the Westminster Assembly.¹ The same tale may be told of many of the paraphrases and hymns now used in Scotland.

The new translation gradually and slowly made its way in Scotland, in spite of strong national and ecclesiastical antipathies. It had been made by the Church of England for its own members, under an Erastian or royal appointment. Some years afterwards Scotland found itself at war with England, and "black prelacy" was accused of sending many sufferers to the dungeons of the Bass, and the scaffolds of the Grassmarket. Yet there is no record of any formal opposition made to the version because of its English origin, and its connection with Laud and his predecessors. The General Assembly of Aberdeen in 1516, though it enjoined Scripture reading, does not select any version for preference. No edict of a Southern Convocation could have had any good effect in the north. Probably if the new Bible had been sent to this side of the Solway armed with a royal proclamation, or enforced by Episcopal canons, it would have been refused, or at all events been regarded with profound suspicion. True, indeed, in the "Canons Constitutional and Ecclesiastical," published in 1636, xvi, 1, it is enacted that there shall be provided for every parish "a Bible of the largest volume—the Bible shall be of the translation of King James." But this edict could have little influence, for in two years the Canons were rejected (in June and September, 1638) by royal proclamation, and afterwards by the General Assembly in December of the same year. There were also bitter memories,

¹ In April, 1646, the House of Commons ordered that Rouse's "Psalms, and no other, shall be sung in all churches and chapels within England, Wales, and Berwick upon Tweed after the 1st of next January." The Lords concurred. The General Assembly, 23rd Nov., 1649, authorized the collection to be the only paraphrase of the Psalms of David to be sung in the Kirk of Scotland, and discharging the old paraphrase or any other to be used in any congregation or family after 1st May, 1650.

like those of the fields of Flodden and Pinkie. King Henry, through his Marshals, had destroyed the Church of Holyrood, the Abbeys of Melrose, Jedburgh, and Kelso, and having carried ruthless fire and sword and ruin through the southern counties, had turned large tracts into deserts, from which man and beast had alike disappeared. But the Bible came alone and "not with observation," having nothing to recommend it save its own merits, and it triumphed in the end over all these animosities and grudges. At an era when Church and State were alike in deep confusion, when mitre and crown had both passed away, this English translation won for itself a lasting home in Scottish hearts, and at length displaced a Bible endeared by the many associations that clustered around the scene of its origin. As Laud had greatly hampered the importation of Genevan Bibles, their scarcity must have somewhat contributed to the circulation of the Authorized Version.

The success of the version was perhaps as rapid in Scotland as in England, for the Psalms retained in the English Prayer Book are of an older and inferior version, and it was not till 1661, as arranged at the Savoy Conference, that the Gospels and Epistles were read out of the Authorized Translation; the Presbyterian nonconforming party having pressed for the change and obtained it with reluctance. The errors of translation selected in pleading for the change were taken from the Great Bible. Rom. xii, 2, "be ye changed in your shape"; Philip. ii, 5, "found in his apparell as a man"; Luke i, 36, "that is the seventh month which was called barren," a misprint; and Gal. iv, 25, the verse which was referred to at the Hampton Court Conference; and also John ii, 10, "when men be drunk"; 2 Cor. iv, 1, "we go not out of kind"; Luke xi, 17, "one house doth fall upon another"; the conclusion being "we therefore desire instead thereof, the new translation allowed by authority may alone be used." The concurrence of the bishops is thus recorded, "We are wishing that all the Epistles and Gospels be used according to the last translation."¹ The old translation had thus been receiving the assent and consent of all taking orders, to the disparagement of King

¹ Cardwell's Conferences, p. 307, 362.

James's version, and that for half a century. On the other hand, a prominent Covenanter, in a book published in 1637, speaks as we now do of "our own English translation." The Directory for Public Worship, ratified by the General Assembly in 1645, enacts, "All the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament shall be publicly read in the vulgar tongue out of the best allowed translation;" the words implying that more translations than one might be or were in common use, and that no version was to be singled out and sanctioned by public authority. Properly speaking, there is therefore no Authorized Version in Scotland. The Westminster Confession (i, 8), says, "The Old Testament in Hebrew, and the New Testament in Greek, being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical, as in all controversies of religion, the church is finally to appeal unto them." The use of the Genevan version still lingered, and it is occasionally quoted in the Acts of the General Assembly, as "negligently" for "deceitfully," Jer. xlviii, 10; "behave rationally" for "play the men," 2 Sam. x, 12; "just" for "upright," Psalm cxix, 137. It crops out also, though very rarely, in the Westminster Confession, 1647, as in the quotation in the Epistle to the Reader of Prov. xix, 2, "without knowledge the mind cannot be good."

No edition of King James's translation was printed in Scotland during his reign. The New Testament was published in 1628 (Heirs of Andro Hart), and the Calendar of Moveable Feasts mentions, with Scottish jealousy, only Whitsunday, Easterday, and the beginning of Lentron. New Testaments were printed in Edinburgh in 1642 by Evan Tyler, R. Young, and James Bryson; and the entire Bible in connection with the coronation of Charles at Scone, in 1633—the first by the heirs of Andro Hart, and the second by the "printers to the king's most excellent majesty." Of this last edition there are two issues, and some of the copies have plates called "Popish pictures," for which Laud was greatly blamed. These "pictures" are remarkably good engravings, the originals having appeared in *Imagines Vitae, Passionis, et Mortis D. N. Jesu Christi*, printed by Boetius a Bolswert, 1623. The writer of a letter

preserved by Lord Hailes styles them "such abominable pictures, that impiety stares through them."¹ Scotland was therefore indebted in the interval to England for its Bibles, and there must have been a continuous importation, for Kirkton, at a period before the Restoration, declares that "every family almost had a Bible."²

A New Testament was printed at Glasgow in 1670, and another, very badly printed, in 1691. The worst of all the specimens is an Edinburgh one, said, however, by some to have been imported, and in it there is scarcely a verse without a blunder.

On February 9th, 1671, the Lords of the Privy Council stigmatized a New Testament, printed in black letter, by Andro Anderson, as having many gross errors and faults in the impression, and prohibited its circulation, or "till the same be first amended." But this very printer, who had been so reprimanded, obtained a gift under the Great Seal, and ratified by Parliament, "constituting him, his heirs, and assignees, to be his Majesty's sole, absolute, and only printer." Anderson and his widow after him were patentees for many years—from 1671 to 1712. It was strictly forbidden to import Bibles; and though the king's printer was "holden to serve the country" with Bibles of his own printing, Anderson, though many miscellaneous works issued from his press, printed only two small editions during the first five years of his appointment. It was the age of patents, for which money was given, or royal debts discharged. In Scotland the patent extended to all printing; the Act 1551, cap. 27, being entitled "printers should print nothing without license." James Watson, in his "History of Printing," says, "By this gift" to Mr. Anderson "the art of printing got a dead stroke, for by it no man could print

¹ Hailes' Memorials and Letters, vol. II, p. 42. In the edition which the writer possesses there is no print that might be called truly Popish but one, in the Common Prayer lines under it, the last of which styles her "daughter, mother, spouse of God."

² Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, pp. 48-50. This history, however, is characterized by the Virgin and Child, and has four romantic exaggerations.

anything from a Bible to a ballad without Mr. Anderson's license." . . . "Editions of Poole's Annotations and Flavel's Works are, in the eyes of workmen, voluminous botches."¹ Of course many copies were carried north from England. Mrs. Anderson complained to the Privy Council of several editions brought into the country, and she winds up by asserting that her monopoly, if duly guarded, would "hinder the export of great summes of money, which are daylie taken furth thereof, for forrayne Bibles." But the traffic had been distinctly authorized in 1671, under this condition, "until the king's printer shall have ready an impression of his own." In 1676, all importation of Bibles in nonpareil and pearl letter was prohibited, and all such copies found are "confiscable." It is not our purpose to state at length how stoutly Widow Anderson battled for her patent, year after year, against all intruders, and managed to have them fined and imprisoned. It is with her work that we are concerned. Some of the editions issued by her husband had been good, especially an octavo of 1676; but her printing of Scripture, at this time, was utterly scandalous, and the other books which she printed were equally full of errors. The patent was not confined to Bibles, yet she affirms of them, that they were much better and on finer paper than could be done in England. Her Bibles swarmed with deplorable blunders, and the gross carelessness of the printing was fostered by the want of all competition.²

Many of the errors are monstrous. One writer gives a few of them in a list which fills six columns of quarto size, closely printed, such as "righteousness" for "unrighteousness;" "he killed," for "he is killed"; "enticed in every thing," for

¹ History of Printing, Preface, p. 12, Edinburgh, 1713.

² After Mrs. Anderson's time, Baskett became king's printer for both England and Scotland. Freebairn had held the office for a time, and though as a Jacobite he joined the standard of the Earl of Mar, and issued proclamations for the Pretender against the Government, he

did not forfeit his patent. He was the fourth king's printer arraigned for treasonable acts. Lekprevik was imprisoned for disloyalty; Evan Tyler was declared a rebel in 1650, but was reinstated at the Restoration; Waldegrave had also been found guilty, but no sentence was passed upon him.

"enriched in every thing"; "either" for "neither"; "would" for "word"; "perfect" for "priest"; "we know," for "we keep"; "hast slain," for "wast slain." One of her Testaments was printed with worn-out type and a title-page having the names of Bill and Newcomb; and in it there are five columns in which, the fount being exhausted, the italic *a* occurs 700 times. An octavo edition of 1694, sometimes said to be spurious, but accepted by Principal Lee as genuine, is crowded with errors, a copy of which in the British Museum has a note-book attached to it, in which are marked such errors as these: Matt. ii, 18, "Rame," for "Ramah"; vii, 3, "brackers," for "brother's"; vii, 27, "the house," for "that house"; viii, 12, "dardness," for "darkness"; viii, 27, "obey them," for "obey him"; xiii, 41, "them which do do iniquity"; xxii, 15, "when," for "went"; xxii, 46, "and," for "ask"; Mark ii, 18, "the disciples of John and of John" for "of John and of the Pharisees"; vii, 35, "his eyes," for "his ears"; Luke viii, 35, "her right mind," for "his"; xxiii, 47, "this man was," for "this was"; John v, 32, "knoweth," for "I know"; vi, 49, "your father," for "your fathers"; vii, 31, "peole," for "people"; ix, 26, "then said they to him again," repeated; x, 3, "leadeth them not," for "out"; Acts ii, 6, "speaking," for "speak in"; x, 23, "longed," for "lodged"; xi, 11, "there," for "three"; xii, 21, "otion," for "oration"; xiii, 23, "accorning," for "according"; xiv, 8, "ma," for "man"; xx, 3, "spira," for "Syria"; xxiv, 24, "Priscilla," for "Dru-silla"; xxvi, 14, "beaking," for "speaking"; Rom. viii, 32, "forgive," for "give"; 1 Cor. ix, 1, "seen Jesus," for "not seen"; xiii, 4, "wanteth," for "vaunteth"; 2 Cor. x, 14, "preached," for "reached"; 2 Thess. i, 9, "published," for "punished"; 2 Tim. iv, 4, "tears," for "ears"; iv, 16, "with stood," for "stood with"; James v, 20, "which covereth the sinner," for "converteth"; 1 Peter iii, 11, "speak," for "seek." In another edition, Mark iii, 26, has "against Satan," for "against himself"; Luke i, 31, "bring far," for "bring forth"; Rom. vi, 17, "ye were not the servants of sin," for "ye were the servants of sin"; Rom. viii, 33, "eject" for "elect." The misprints in spelling were hideous.

Mrs. Anderson has been sometimes imitated by her successors. An Edinburgh edition of 1760 has, in Heb. ii, 16, "he took on him the nature of angels," *not* being omitted; and another of 1791 reads, "make me not to go the way of thy commandments," and one of 1816 (Blair & Bruce) has, Luke vi, 29, "forbid to take thy coat also," the omission of *not* reversing the meaning of the precept. Baskett's patent rights extended to Scotland, and his edition of 1742 has these blunders: Matt. ix, 22, "thy faith hath made me whole," for "thee"; xviii, 29, "pay they all," for "thee"; xxvi, 50, "wherefore at thou come," for "art"; Mark ii, 21, "the rent is many worse," for "made"; John xvi, 8, "reprove the word," for "world"; xvi, 24, "ask and we shall receive" for "ye"; xvii, 2, "as to many," for "to as many"; Rom. xi, 26, "shall the deliver come," for "deliverer"; ii, 28, "sake," for "sakes"; Phil. iii, 12, "Now as though I had," for "not as though"; 1 Peter iv, 11, "to whom he praise," for "be"; Job xviii, 8, "be walketh," for "he walketh"; xx, 3, "causeth me no answer," for "to answer"; Isaiah i, 9, "let us a small remnant," for "left unto us"; iii, 9, "then soul" for "their soul"; xii, 3, (The Lord is become my salvation) "therefore with joy shall he draw water," instead of "shall ye draw water"; xiii, 15, "Every one that it found," for "is found." In a Bible of 1791 (Mark & Charles Kerr, Edinburgh) 1 Kings xxii, 38, reads, "the dogs liked his blood," for "licked"; Psalm cxix, 35, "make me not to know," for "make me to go." Instances of a similar nature might be multiplied at great length: "let all tongues be done decently," in a copy of 1816; and editions of 1811 and 1814 have "store against the wall," for "storm," Isaiah xxv, 4; "Esther" for "Easter," Acts xii, 4; "fighting upon him," instead of "lighting upon him," Matt. iii, 16; "Anna lived with an husband seventy years from her virginity," Luke ii, 36. Copies printed in Edinburgh during this century are not immaculate; and Principal Lee points out the following: Micah vi, 16, "thereof," for "therefore"; Luke iv, 28, "hear," for "heard"; Gal. ii, 21, "in," for "vain"; James i, 27, "her," for "their"; Isa. xl, 3, "made," for "make"; Jer. xv, 10, "hath," for "have"; Matt. xvii, 27, "comest," for "cometh"; xviii, 17,

"the," for "thee"; Mark x, 52, "the," for "thee"; Luke vii, 21, "may," for "many"; Acts viii, 22, "my," for "may"; Luke viii, 14, "they," for "that"; xx, 15, "them," for "him"; Phil. i, 25, "you," for "your"; 1 Peter iii, 18, "offered," for "suffered"; Matt. xvii, 27, "comest," for "cometh"; Mark xi, 8, "strayed," for "strawed"; 1 Cor. iv. 6, "puffed," for "puffed up"; Ezek. viii, 1, "fifty," for "fifth"; Zeph. ii, 7, "cost," for "coast"; 1 Thess. iii, 7, "four," for "your." Carelessness so gross is intolerable.

But amidst Scottish editions of the Bible, those printed in Edinburgh by James Watson, his smaller Bibles of 1715, 1716, 1719, and especially his folio of 1722, occupy a conspicuous and honoured place. He, like Ruddiman the well known Latinist, was tainted with Jacobitism. The inaccuracy of the printed Bible was a subject often brought before the General Assembly of the Kirk, and injunctions about it formed one of the annual instructions to the Commission. But no effective step was ever taken to remedy the grievance. A deliverance was given by the Assembly itself in 1794, in reply to an overture on the subject from the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr.

Friday, May 24, 1793.

"The General Assembly resumed the consideration of the overture from the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, respecting the more accurate printing of common Bibles; and the Overture being again read, a letter from the King's printer to the Moderator was also read, and along with it specimens of a new edition of the common Bible were produced. The Assembly feel it their bounden duty to pay every attention to the printing of the Bible; but upon considering the letter from his Majesty's printer, and having viewed the said specimens which were given in, they think it unnecessary to proceed any farther in this matter at present."

The New Testaments printed for use in schools were often nearly illegible, and the paper was so bad that it often adhered to the types. Many editions were printed in Glasgow; and of these editions those from the press of Alexander Carmichael and Alexander Melrose & Company, 1737, and those from the

press of John Robertson and Mrs. McLean & Company, 1748, are fairly legible, though the supplemented words are not printed in italic type.

But the desire for a more perfect version had been cherished in Scotland at an early period, and in 1655 there was a proposal for a revision, in the following significant and quaint terms:—

For y^e bettering of y^e Inglish translation of y^e Bible (1st printed A.D. 1612) by Mr Jn^o Row,¹ 'tis offer'd. That these five things are to be endeavoured :

I. That evil and unmeet divisions of chapt^{rs}, verses, and sentences be rectify'd, and made more proper, rationall, and dexterous, w^{ch} will much clear ye scope.

II. That needles transpositions of words, or stories, p^ttending to Hypall or Synchyses, be warily amended; or noted if they cannot.

III. That all vseles additions be lop't off, y^t debase the wisdom of y^e spirit;—to instance

1. All y^e Apocryphall writings; being meerly humane.
2. All popish and superstitious prints, plates, and pictures.
3. Apotheosing and canonizing of some (not oth^{rs}) as Sts., S^t Luke: not St. Job. . . .
4. Spurious additions or subscriptions (to Epistles), words and sentences.

IV. That all sinfull and needles detractiōs be supply'd; and y^t lies in 6 things—viz.,

1. Let all sentences, or words detracted, be added in y^e text.

¹The Rows were a family of note and learning. The first of them studied in Italy, and on his return to Scotland he adopted the principles of the Reformation. Died 1589. Five of his sons became ministers. His third son, John Row, minister of the parish of Carnock, wrote the well known History of the Kirk of Scotland. The second son of the minister of Carnock is the author of the proposals for revision. He was sometime master of the Grammar School, Perth; and afterwards principal of King's College, Aberdeen. In 1644 appeared his Hebrew Grammar, Institutiones—the first book of the kind printed in Scotland, and it was printed in Glasgow. The Town Council of Aberdeen ordained their "Thesaurer" to give the author "for his paines four hundreth merks." Died about 1675. A third generation of the name had their place among the Scottish clergy, the youngest surviving till about 1700.

2. Epitomize y^e contents and chapt^{rs} better at y^e topps of y^e leafe.
3. The parenthesis ought not to be omitted where 'tis.
4. Exhaust not the emphasis of a word (as Idols, thirteen wayes exprest).
5. Nor y^e superlative, left only as a positive.
6. Notifactum, not noticed at all.

V. As respecting mutation, or change, 4 things are needful, namely—

1. That nothing be changed but convine't apparently, to be bett^r.
2. Yet a change not hurting truth, piety, or y^e text, may be just and needfull.
3. Many evil changes are to be amended, as these 9 in particular.

- (1) When words, or sentences, are mistaken.
- (2) When y^e margin is righter than y^e line, as in 800 places (and more) it is.
- (3) When particles are confounded.
- (4) When a word plurall is translated as singular.
- (5) When the active is rendered as if a passive.
- (6) When the genders are confounded: as mostly y^e cantic bee.
- (7) When Hebrismes are omitted, in silence, or amisse.
- (8) When participium patil is rendred as if it were nyphall.
- (9) When conjugatio pyel is Inglish't as if kal.

4. (On the other hand) 9 good changes are to be warily endeavour'd, viz :

- (1) Put y^e titles of y^e true God (all ouer) literâ capitali.
- (2) Let majistrates correct misprinting of Bibles.
- (3) Put more in Inglish (even *propria nomina* :) less in Heb., Gr., and Latin terms.
- (4) That Inglish words (not understood in Scotland) be idiomatiz'd.
- (5) That all be analogical to Scripture termes, not toucht wth our opinion, or error.
- (6) Something equivocal to Keri, and Kethib, be noticed.
- (7) That letters, poynts, and stopps, be distinctly notified.
- (8) The paralel places ought to be well noted, in the margin.
- (9) Things not amiss, may be endcavo'd to be bettered.

The like is (as to y^e N. T.) to be endeavored, many words wanting their owne native idiom and import, and sometimes y^e translation overflows in y^e English; or els is defective: and some words confounded: (Ex: gr: *δυναμις*, power, and *ἐξουσία*, in 70 or near 80 places translated *power* w^{ch} is properly *authority*, &c.

All this has been essayed by divers able Hebritians: as M^r H: J: M^r Jⁿ C., &c., whose notes and pains are yet conceal'd in private hands, but may come to light, and publick use, in due time.

But no action was taken in connection with this minute and elaborate proposal.

While there are three privileged presses in England, there was only one patentee in Scotland, and, therefore, a complete monopoly. The last holders of the patent, Sir David Hunter Blair and John Bruce, Esq., latterly his niece, Mrs. Margaret Tindal Bruce, brought an action at law against Bible Societies in Scotland, and in 1824 succeeded in interdicting them from bringing into Scotland any copies of the Holy Scriptures printed in England. The case was carried by appeal to the House of Lords, and the decision of the Court of Session was affirmed in 1829. The result was that the British and Foreign Bible Society might despatch Bibles to all the ends of the earth, but they durst not send down an English Bible into Scotland, even to their own auxiliaries. Had such a law been enforced in earlier times, what should have been the condition of Scotland? It had plenty of Bibles, but it printed only one edition of the Genevan in 1576-9, and another in 1610, both issued by persons who did not hold the king's patent; and it did not print the present version for more than twenty years after its publication in 1611. Scotland therefore got its Bible chiefly from England, and the king's printer did not then prevent it. The monopoly was at length abolished in 1839, and the presses are free to print the Scriptures, subject to the supervision of a Board in Edinburgh, of which the Lord Advocate is the head. The printer must inform the Board as to the edition which he means to put to press, and enter into a bond for £500. Every sheet printed by him is sent for the inspection of the Board, and not till it is passed by them or their reader is he

allowed to issue it, the Board having power to order any erroneous page to be cancelled. After the abolition of the monopoly, Bibles fell at once one-half in price, and the "Reports" show that there is a large increase of circulation. The patent still existing in England gives the patentees power, according to its express and comprehensive terms, over "any Bibles or New Testaments in the English tongue, of any translation, with notes or without notes." Were this power to be exercised to its full extent, all popular and practical expositions of Scripture would be suppressed. Dr. Cotton, in 1856, had an edition of the Four Gospels printed at Oxford, but the Delegates of the University Press put it down. In it the headings were omitted, the words usually printed in italics were put within brackets; and pronouns referring to the Saviour began with a capital letter. But the book was an infringement of the patent, and the plates were sent to America. An attempt was made in 1819 to inhibit a Family Bible, but the measure raised such a clamour that it was not persevered in. Pasham evaded the patent by printing notes at the bottom of the page, a considerable space being left between them and the text, so that in binding the book the notes were cut off, and the volume remained in its symmetry.

If the full truth must be told of the reception in Scotland of the version executed under King James, then it is to be added that there was a very small party that rejected and maligned it. This party was a little band of frenzied men and women, extremer than the extremest of the Covenanters, so rabid and reasonless that even Donald Cargill, the intrepid leader and martyr, who tried to deal with them, was obliged in despair to give them up. They were called the "Sweet Singers of Borrowstouness," the leader being "Muckle John Gib,"¹ a ship captain, belonging to that small seaport on the Frith of Forth.² They carried about in their handkerchiefs the blood of two recent martyrs; they scattered anathemas very profusely; and the Psalms

¹ Some one amused the Conference here referred to in the text certainly at Hampton Court by describing a suited that definition.

Puritan as a Protestant frayed out ² Woodrow's History, vol. III, p. of his wits, and the saying might be 348. Chambers's Domestic Annals regarded as clever; but the men of Scotland, vol. II, p. 414.

which they delighted to sing were the lxxiv, lxxx, lxxxiii, and cxxxvii. They numbered twenty-six; and in 1681 they left their ordinary occupations, betook themselves to the moors and wilds to be free of all "snares and sins," and some of them attempted to return to primeval habits; but the naked truth could neither be enjoyed under the Scottish climate, nor tolerated by the civil magistrate. This last freak did not last more than two or three days. When any husband, in urging his wife not to go out with the party, caught hold of her dress, she at once washed the place as if to remove an impurity. These poor misguided creatures were at length apprehended by a troop of dragoons at the Woolhill Craigs, and taken to Edinburgh—the men being lodged in the Tolbooth, and the women sent to the House of Correction.¹ Most of the women, however, had gone home before the capture, and those taken to Edinburgh, on receiving a copy of the manifesto written by their leaders, "renounced us and called us devils." When in confinement, four of the men sent out a protest, which among other things says, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to take out of our Bibles the Psalms in metre," quoting in support of the act Rev. xxii, 18. "We, being pressed to the work by the Holy Ghost, do renounce the impression and translation of both the Old and New Testament," their objection being to the Dedication, to the division of chapters and of verses as of human invention, and to "the drawing scores betwixt the books of the Bible." They also denounced the General Assembly, the Confession, the Covenants, and all the allied documents, even those that contained the excommunication of their opponents. Especially did they protest against the "limiting of the Lord's mind by glasses," that is, by the pulpit sand-glasses which regulated the duration of the sermon. They also "renounced and declined all authority throughout the world," with the "pagan names of the months and the days of

¹Crookshank's History of the Glasgow, 1836; "Gib's Blasphemous Church of Scotland, vol. II, p. 93, Papers, May 1st, 1681," and Cargill's Edinburgh, 1762; Woodrow's History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, vol. III, p. 348, &c., row.

the week." Their lengthened nocturnal fasts which they had kept in frost and snow, "while our clothes were frozen on us, and our feet frozen in our shoes," helped to create their deplorable mania. With the women that followed them, "their spirits were many a time burthened," and they longed to get quit of them; and as they were afraid of immoral suspicions, they kept them in comparative seclusion. The Council at Edinburgh, regarding them as crazed and harmless, set them at liberty after a brief confinement; the epidemic soon subsided, and most of them returned to their "right mind."

Unaccountably backward though Scotland was to edit and print Bibles for itself, the Scottish people have been often accused of Bibliolatry, not merely of placing all faith in Scripture, but of regarding the mere volume with superstitious attachment. Mrs. Somerville, the celebrated writer on physical science, records in her Autobiography that "during a thunder-storm, my mother always asked my father to shut the window, and though she was no longer able to see to read, she kept the Bible on her knee for protection." The following anecdote, referring to a period little more than twenty years ago, is vouched for: A widow in a Scottish county town had been left by her husband at his death a considerable amount of property, with a mortgage on it. Her trouble was whether she should pay the interest on the mortgage, and keep the property entire, or sell a portion of it, and discharge at once the encumbrance. Many weeks of thought and consultation passed, and at length one morning she met her minister, with a blythe countenance, and the joyous statement that now she saw her way through the difficulty, and that her mind was at rest. On being asked how she had come to such a happy and peremptory decision, she told him that she had happened to read that morning the sixtieth Psalm, and that the sixth verse, which said, "I will divide Shechem, and mete out the valley of Succoth," forcibly struck her, and appeared to give her the light and direction which she so earnestly desired. She sold at once, as if by divine warrant, a portion of her inheritance, and freed the remainder from all pecuniary burdens.¹

¹ Personal Recollections, p. 17, London, 1873.

So popular is the English Bible, and so cheap withal, that it is in all men's hands, and many of its sayings, "graven with an iron pen" on the memory, are "familiar in their mouths as household words." The following clauses are often uttered, without any conscious recollection of their origin: "escaped with the skin of his teeth," "at their wit's end," "the root of the matter," "the pen of a ready writer," "burden and heat of the day," "merchant princes," "a part of fat things," "spreading like a green bay tree," "fearfully and wonderfully made," "the threescore and ten," "an uncertain sound," "physician, heal thyself," "nothing new under the sun," "his long home," "the one thing needful."

But if the English Bible be so good a translation, and so clear and vigorous in its style, surely its verses and clauses should always be quoted with exactness. There are, however, many and constant forms of inaccurate quotation both in discourses and in prayer. This incorrectness often proceeds from careless habit, and it may be said to be inherited, like original sin. The changes often meant as improvements are useless and tasteless—"painting the lily." Sometimes it seems as if the figures were felt to be too sharp, and they are blunted by interpolating "as."¹

Psalms xlv, 1, "My tongue is *as* the pen of a ready writer."

1 Tim. iv, 2, "Having their consciences seared *as* with a hot iron."

Heb. x, 22, Our bodies washed *as* with pure water."

There are many forms of misquotation, which arise from a desire to add emphasis—

Deut. xxxiii, 25, "As thy days, *day is*, so shall thy strength be."

Eccles. xi, 1, "Cast thy bread upon the waters; for thou shalt find it *again* after many days."

Hab. ii, 2, "Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, *So plain that he that runneth may read.*"

John viii, 7, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone, *cast the first stone*, at her."

Gen. xxviii, 17, "This is none other but the house of God, and *this is* the gate of heaven."

¹ The changed or added words are printed in italics.

1 Kings iv, 25, Micah iv, 4, "Every man under his *own* vine," &c.

Job xiii, 11, "Shall not his excellency make you *suitably* afraid?"

Ps. xxiii, 4, "Yea though I walk through the *dark* valley of the shadow of death."

Ps. xc, 12, "So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto *true* wisdom."

Eccles. i, 10, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with *all* thy might."

Ezek. xxxiii, 11, "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but *rather* that the wicked turn," &c.

John xvi, 8, "He will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment *to come.*"

Acts xxiv, 25, "Go thy way for this time; when I have a *more* convenient season I will call for thee."

Rom. vii, 24, "Oh wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? *this body of sin and death.*"

1 Cor. xi, 26, "Ye do show *forth* the Lord's death till he come."

Heb. ix, 27, "And as it is appointed unto *all* men once to die."

Ps. lxxv, 6, "For promotion cometh neither from the east nor from the west, *nor from the north*, nor from the south."

Isaiah i, 6, "From the sole of the foot even unto the *crown of the* head, there is no soundness in it."

Isaiah lviii, 13, "Not doing thine own ways, nor *thinking thine own* thoughts, nor finding thine own pleasure."

Hab. i, 13, "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity *but with abhorrence.*"

Matt. xviii, 20, "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them, *and that to bless them.*"

1 Cor. ii, 9, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, *to conceive* the things," &c.

2 Cor. xiii, 14, "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion *and fellowship* of the Holy Ghost, *rest and abide* with you all, *now, henceforth, and forever.*"

Rev. xxii, 18, "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him *come and* take the water of life freely."

Isaiah xxxv, 8, "The wayfaring men, though fools, shall, *need*, not err therein."

Rom. xii, 11, "*Diligent* in business."

Ps. lxxxiv, 9, "Look upon *us*, in the face of thine anointed."

Dan. iv, 35, "None can stay his hand *from working*."

Job xv, 16, "Which drinketh up iniquity as the thirsty ox drinketh up the water."

Job xx, 12, The confession in prayer is frequent: "*We roll sin as a sweet morsel under our tongue*," the true words being simply, "though wickedness be sweet in his mouth, though he hide it under his tongue."

Ps. iv, 6, "The light of thy *reconciled* countenance."

Heb. xii, 29, "God *out of Christ* is a consuming fire," but the text is, "our God is a consuming fire."

Ps. cxlv, 9, "His tender mercies are over all his *other* works."

Somebody has taken in hand the thankless and mechanical task of counting, not only the chapters and verses, but also the words and letters of the English Bible; the result may be regarded as a curiosity in its way.

	Old Testament.	New Testament.	Total.
Books, . . .	39	27	66
Chapters, . . .	929	260	1,189
Verses, . . .	23,214	7,959	31,173
Words, . . .	592,439	181,258	773,697
Letters, . . .	2,728,100	868,388	3,566,480

APOCRYPHA.

Chapters, 183. Verses, 6,081. Words, 152,185.

The middle chapter, and the least in the Bible, is Psalm cxvii.

OLD TESTAMENT.

The middle book is Proverbs.

The middle chapter is Job xxix.

The middle verse is 2 Chron. xx, and between 17th and 18th verses.

The least verse is 1 Chron. i, 1.

NEW TESTAMENT.

The middle book is 2 Thessalonians.

The middle chapter is between Romans xiii and xiv.

The middle verse is Acts xvii, 17.

The least verse is John xi, 35,

The 21st verse of the 7th chapter of Ezra has all the letters of the alphabet.¹

¹ Notes and Queries, Second Series, vol. VII, p. 431.

Such has been the varied, wonderful, and suggestive history of the English Bible. The Divine Record, even in its earliest form, was intended for universal diffusion—to guard men against Atheism, Polytheism, and Pantheism; to keep them from forgetting God by the deification of second causes, by the formation of local and limited divinities, or by merging the finite in the infinite; and at the same time to exhibit His character as a Being near them, and not far away above the stars, that they might be induced to trust, worship, and serve him. Such teaching, as human history has shown, was needed everywhere, and everywhere was it to be carried. Its first language, indeed, in the older form of Phœnician, was employed by the earliest merchants, seafaring adventurers, and colonists; but in its Biblical uses and aspects, it became very much confined to Canaan, and was unknown to the successive great empires around it, though Nineveh and Babylon spoke a varying dialect of it. So that, while Judaism was organized as a standing protest in behalf of the Divine Personality, Spirituality, and Fatherhood, it did not formally proclaim those truths to the world on all sides of it. It never so awoke as to realize its position of being "in the midst of many people as a dew from the Lord." It did not care to spread itself; it might welcome proselytes, but it never went in search of them. No ships left Joppa bearing prophets and precious parchments. The Alexandrian Version at length unlocked the Hebrew treasures to the western world—Tarshish and the Isles of the Gentiles. "In the fulness of the time" appeared the Son of God, who "spake as never man spake," in words fitted to all ears and hearts, and died as never man died—died in Palestine, but died for all the world; founding, in his Self-offering on Calvary, a universal dispensation, without distinction of age, race, or country. His first followers had learned to speak another tongue than that of their fathers, though they used it also.¹ This second tongue had been carried

¹ When the apostle addressed the mob at Jerusalem they expected a tongue to them," just as a crowd in Greek oration, and they naturally Inverness some years ago would have "kept the more silence" when "they acted, if they had expected an Eng-

by the Grecian arms around the shores of the Mediterranean, and over the East, and therefore the Gospels and Epistles were written in it, for it was everywhere current. It was not, indeed, Greek in its glory, but such was its versatility, copiousness, and force, that it nobly bore upon it a message which it had never carried in the Porch or the Academy. The power of the case-endings had ceased to be felt as formerly, and prepositions were employed to mark relations; simple verbs often gave place to compound forms; thoughts, words, and syntactic structure had a Hebrew tinge, and now and then terms were coined to convey the new ideas essentially connected with the New Covenant. But it was the Greek of the time, and a popular faith was preached in a popular tongue, easily understood by all classes. At length the Latin tongue shared in the supremacy of the people that spoke it, and into it the inspired collection of *Lives and Letters* was translated for the European and North African churches. The Latin Bible held a lofty place for centuries, and the Latin Church was very unwilling that its Book, though only a translation, should be turned into any living dialect, and laboured to keep all knowledge locked up in the brains and libraries of its own ministers. There had been a Syriac and Gothic version at a bypast time, but the battle for vernacular Scripture was fought out on this island, and, through fire and blood, truth and freedom at length conquered. A few faint efforts had been made at a remote epoch, and with such efforts the names of Bede and Alfred are immortally associated. Their successors did what they could in fragments and paraphrases. Wycliffe at length gave his nation a whole Bible, and many accorded to the gift a grateful reception. The branches of the fig-tree had become tender, and "were putting forth leaves," for summer was coming, with its life and warmth. In the meantime books and men alike were sacrificed to the ecclesiastical Moloch. Two centuries afterwards Tyndale translated the New Testament from the original Greek. His version was reprinted by Coverdale, had a place in the Great Bible, was revised in the Genevan and the Bishops', and then

lish speech, and they too would have bespoke their attention in a Gaelic "kept the more silence" if the orator preamble (Acts xxii, 2).

took its present place as a portion of the Authorized Version. The Old Testament, chiefly produced by Coverdale, has come to us by a similar course of successive revisions. The ancestral history of our Bible shows that spiritual despotism, in its selfish, short-sighted policy, defeats its cherished ends, and that liberty and progress, connected with the open Book of God, must at length triumph. The English Bible is consecrated by the blood of martyrs. Wycliffe was not murdered, but in revenge for his exemption his bones were exhumed and burned; Tyndale was strangled and consumed to ashes; Coverdale escaped almost by miracle; Rogers and Cranmer "loved not their lives unto the death"; the Genevan scholars were exiles, while many of their brethren at home were perishing at Smithfield; the Elizabethan bishops had been in imminent peril during a season when the "hour" was ruled by "the power of darkness." The divine presence was frequently and palpably apparent in moulding circumstances, in paralyzing the arm of opposition, and in cheering and supporting those who were walking in the furnace. We have enjoyed this Bible for two centuries and a half; and its general fidelity, and the nervous and beautiful diction in which it clothes the divine counsels, have always commended it; while the blessed results of its spiritual power make themselves visible in myriads of ways, through all the shires and cities of the land.

Having survived all perils, and having had many romantic "crooks in its lot," it is still abroad in its might—not as of old, in heavy folios, but in handy volumes—closet and pocket companions. It costs only a trifle, so that it is within the reach of every one. It has found a home under the Southern Cross—in Australia and New Zealand, and in the United States it has multiplied itself with inconceivable rapidity. The sun never sets upon it. It has spread, and will spread with the English name and influence round the globe. All people speaking our tongue are united by their common Bibles, common temples, and the blessing of a "common salvation." Our forefathers gave it welcome, and their descendants can never bid it farewell, for the oracle is always fulfilling itself, "Tell ye your children of it, and let your children tell their children,

and their children another generation." Englishmen shall never weary of reading the Blessed Life told in these Gospels, and in that charming style which, rising above all provincial peculiarities, forms one fraternal speech to all that "in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours." Centuries have passed over it, but its youth abides. Many volumes far younger than it have perished in the wreck of years. The majority of books published among us are connected with it—either against it, or for it, or upon it. Though revised, it will ever preserve its identity; as the statue is the same though its features be brightened when the dust is blown off it. It can be superseded only when the higher relations and developments of its truths are revealed to us in another sphere, where we "shall know even as we are known."

"Now blessed be the Lord our God,
The God of Israel,
For He alone doth wondrous works,
In glory that excel.
And blessed be His glorious name
To all eternity:
The whole earth let his glory fill.
Amen, so let it be."

REVISION OF
THE NEW TESTAMENT.

"Count it as a thyng not havyng his full shape, but as it were borne afore hys tyme, even as a thyng begunne rather than fynished. In tyme to come . . . we will give it hys full shape."—Tyndale, Epilogue to his New Testament, 1526.

"For the which cause, according as I was desyred, I took the more upon me to set forth this special translation, not as a checker, not as a reprover or despiser of other men's translations; for among many I have as yet found none without occasion of great thanksgiving unto God. . . . Howbeit, whereinsoever I can perceive by myself, or by the information of other, that I have failed (as it is no wonder), I shall now, by the help of God, overlook it better and amend it."—Prologue to Coverdale's Bible.

"No offence can be justly taken for this new labour, nothing prejudicing any other man's judgment by this doing, nor yet hereby professing this to be so absolute a translation as that hereafter might follow no other that might see that which as yet was not understood."—Preface to the Bishops' Bible.

"If hereafter we espie any of our owne errors, or if any other, either friend, of good will, or adversarie, for desire of reprehension, shal open to us the same, we will not, as Protestants doe, for defence of our estimation, or of pride and contention, by wrangling wordes wilfully persist in them, but be most glad to heare of them, and in the next edition, or otherwise, to correct them."—Preface to the Rheims Translation.

". . . The translating of the Scriptures; the which thing albeit that divers heretofore have endeavoured to achieve, yet, considering the infancy of those times, and the imperfect knowledge of the tongues, in respect of this ripe age and clear light which God hath now revealed, the translations required greatly to be perused and reformed."—Preface to the Genevan Bible.

"As nothing is begun and perited at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser, so, if we in building on their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, do endeavour to make that better which they left so good, no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us."—Preface to the Authorized Version.

CHAPTER L.

THE exposure of any one to suspicion and obloquy, because he ventures to touch the Scriptures, no matter how reverently and lovingly, is not an occurrence of yesterday. Nor is this jealousy to be wondered at; for, as the Bible is the divine charter, its words are of unsurpassed value. The sacred volume has naturally come to be enthroned in the heart of myriads as a book of solitary majesty. Their spiritual life has been quickened by it; they have felt its formative power; and in calm and devout moments they are conscious of its secret and searching influence as they breathe its penitential Psalms, or ponder the wonderful discourse followed by the more wonderful prayer in the gospel of St. John. Indignant surprise would therefore be excited if any one should dare to deal wickedly with God's revelation, by adding to it or taking from it, or in any way tampering with its holy contents. For such procedure would really be an attempt to produce a new Bible; and no one within the pale of the church can be guilty of the profane temerity of erasing, changing, superseding, or improving, the words of Apostles and Prophets.

But the Bible, while it is divine in the highest sense, is also human in the truest sense; and its human aspects and history are never to be overlooked in the adoration of its divine "imbreathment." While it is from heaven in its blessed and primary source, it is as surely of earth in its nearer form and delivery—God's thoughts in man's words. While Psalmists and Evangelists spoke and wrote as they were "moved by the Holy Ghost," they were no mere machines, no mere passive recipients and outgivers, like the strings of a harp struck by a

supernatural plectrum, according to the old and familiar figure. They were not pens, but penmen, each expressing his thoughts in as real accordance with his own temperament and his own characteristic style of utterance, as if no God-given influence had been possessed. That man speaks to man in Scripture, is a fact which is not to be hidden away in the lustre of its heavenly origin. Thus sang the bard, thus reasoned the apostle, are facts co-existing in equal truth with "thus saith the Lord."

Now we can only get at the divine element by a comprehension of the human terms—the husk is to be pierced in order to possess ourselves of the kernel. It is therefore of supreme moment to know what are the words which have been chosen to bear upon them a divine message, and to be convinced that they have been faithfully transmitted to us. Why contend for the inspiration of any document, or attempt to translate it, if we have not faith in its genuineness and integrity? If some essential vocables have been lost or changed, if there are fragmentary clauses or dismal spaces out of which precious syllables have dropped and disappeared; if the message be not given to us with substantial fulness and accuracy, we should have little inducement to accept it and study it. How can we have faith in any doctrine if there be a serious dispute as to the words in which it was delivered? Therefore, the settlement of the text takes precedence of apologetics and theology, for it must be a Bible materially the same as when first published, that we either defend or expound. But this primary and indispensable labour on Scripture, in order to have it as nearly as possible in the state in which its holy authors left it—"the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth"—has, so far from being welcomed with gratitude, been despised and scorned with rancorous and malignant hostility. There are some noted examples.

Origen's labours on the Septuagint were not fully appreciated in his own day,¹ and Jerome's work on the Latin version provoked wretched enmity and wild misrepresentation. The cry of falsification and sacrilege was raised against him on the part of men "who thought that ignorance was holiness—biped

¹ Redepenning's *Origenes*, vol. II, 156, &c., Bonn, 1846.

asses who preferred an erroneous and unrevised text."¹ Even Augustine warned him that the task was profane and perilous. Men, "who called his work a translation," accused him of undermining the faith, and disturbing the peace of the church; but the peace which is content with an imperfect text or version of God's Word is only a stolid inertness. When Robert Stephens published an edition of the Vulgate, and revised it by the aid of some MSS., the doctors of the Sorbonne bitterly protested against the innovation, and annoyed in many ways the intelligent and conscientious printer. On the publication of his folio text of the Greek New Testament in 1550, the same censors prohibited the edition, on account of the "annotations," or various readings, which were taken from the Complutensian Polyglott and some MSS., and put into the margin. The editor, apprehensive of personal danger, felt himself under the necessity of quitting Paris, and taking refuge in Geneva. Had the doctrine of the Rhemists and their contemporaries been current at an early period, had there been so bitter hostility to all vernacular translations, their own cherished Vulgate could never have existed at all.

It is a pity that Popish ignorance should be occasionally equalled by Protestant jealousy, as blind to facts as it is deaf to arguments. The controversy between Owen and Walton about the original text of Scripture is well known. Owen had prepared a small treatise on "the divine original, authority, self-evidencing light, and power of the Scriptures," and it was "about to be given out to the stationers" when the Polyglott appeared. The various readings collected in the appendix to it appalled him, for they seemed to loosen the foundation of the thesis which he maintained, and therefore he published "Considerations on the Prolegomena and Appendix to the late Biblia Polyglotta." Some good men, and learned men too, like the Buxtorfs, never dreamed of the possibility of various readings, but imagined that supernatural care had been exercised over

¹ He confesses that he rendered a certain term in Jonah by *hedera* in a church, and its members forsook it, until the old term *cucurbita* was restored. Zöckler's *Hieronymus*, p. A great commotion had been raised 342, &c., Gotha, 1865.

the text of the sacred volume in its transmission to later times. Owen could not deny the existence of various readings, but he laboured to explain them away. In his grief and surprise he trembled for the result, since the notion that a divine volume had not been divinely protected, "bordered," in his opinion, "on atheism"; and Walton himself held a similar view as to a special divine guardianship over the sacred scriptures. Yet life, though it is a divine gift, is not protected by any supernatural shield. Owen praised the Polyglott; but Walton regarded the eulogy "as a shoeing horn to draw on some disgraceful asperities."¹ He could not bear to be told that his magnificent tomes, the wonder of the age, and one of its noblest monuments, were but steps in a road leading either to infidelity or to Rome. Owen totally mistook the nature of textual criticism, when he defined it as an attempt "to correct the Scriptures . . . to correct the Word of God . . . to amend it at the pleasure of men, so that men have no choice but to turn atheists or papists."² The mistake is a glaring one, for the aim of criticism is not to amend the original, but simply to restore it, if possible, to its first and genuine shape. The question was not one of speculation, but of fact and eyesight. Popish writers did take advantage of the existence of various readings to show the necessity of a personal living oracle, and a similar attempt has been recently made in a volume named "Bible Difficulties."³ The author piles up difficulties in connection with text and version, which he exaggerates and represents as insoluble, to prove the need

¹ Considerator Considered, London, 1659.

² But Dr. Owen was not one of that wretched class that branded erudition as fatal to piety, and accounted learning "the language of the beast." Dr. Edward Pocock had been already turned out of his prebend and professorship by the Parliamentary Committee of Triers when Owen appeared before them, and insisted on the "infinite reproach" that should certainly fall upon them if they

should turn out a man so justly admired by all Europe for his vast knowledge and extraordinary accomplishments, adding that he had come "to deliver himself from such disgrace by protesting against a proceeding so strangely foolish and unjust." The hearty appeal was successful. Twell's Life of Pocock, p. 174, London, 1816.

³ Williams and Norgate, London 1869.

of a living and infallible interpreter who possesses the "transmitted authority of Christ." It would be a strange spectacle to behold his Infallible Holiness pronouncing from the chair of St. Peter on various readings in the Greek text of which he had no familiar knowledge, or revising translations in a foreign language of which he did not understand one syllable. The two popes that tried their hand on their own Vulgate gained no credit by their interference.¹ A freethinker, many years afterwards, in Shaftesbury's Characteristics,² asks as to Scripture, "Is it the single reading or that of various readings, the text of these manuscripts, or of those, the transcripts, copies, titles, catalogues of this Church or of that other?" with much more to the same effect, and in proof and fortification a remarkable paragraph is adduced from Jeremy Taylor. Thus infidels and papists alike deduced from the various readings the uncertainty of Scripture. But these illogical inferences were no reason why the clear path of duty should be deserted, and they were not to be warded off by denying the fact of collected and visible variations. If, however, a man like Owen, a great theologian, and the head of a University, felt such tremors and presentiments, how many around him and beneath him must have been tormented by similar fears and anxieties? Referring to the bulk of the "Variants," he says, "I have heard the great Ussher expressing his fears." The fears were groundless. The vehicle may rock, and the oxen may stumble, but the ark is safe, and Uzzah does not need in wanton and faithless temerity to put forth his hand to steady it. Dr. Chalmers, who had no great familiarity with this class of subjects, in describing the collision between Owen and Walton, says, "I know not which was most revolting, the lordly insolence of the prelate, or the outrageous violence of the Puritan." The antithesis is only a rhetorical exaggeration. If insolence occasionally gleams out in Walton, it is not "lordly," for he was not a bishop at the time; some might call Vice-Chancellor Owen's Tract a specimen of ponderous and solemn incompetence; but the charge of "violence" is wholly

¹ See page 109.

² Vol. III, p. 320, London, 1723.

inapplicable to it, for it is the outpouring of a mind overburdened with great sorrow and perplexity.

The saintly Albert Bengel was also malignantly assailed because he touched the text of Scripture. Certain "ministers of God's Word" sharply reprimanded him for "his audacity," unprecedented, in publishing in 1738 a Greek text so different from the received one; and a Catholic opponent in 1741 branded him as a "Bible murderer," hinting at the same time that the church had a temporal as well as a spiritual sword to bring to "obedience all heretics." These and similar accusations and threats wrung from him the prayer, "O that this may be the last occasion of my standing in the gap to vindicate the precious original text of the New Testament!"¹ Jerome had met his opponents in a different spirit—"A lyre is played in vain to an ass,"—"If they will not drink the water from the purest source, let them drink of the muddy streams."

The publication of Mill's New Testament, with its thirty thousand various readings, renewed in England the panic which Walton's Polyglott had originated. Unfavourable and unjust opinions of the work, the result of thirty years' hard labour, were freely circulated, not only by unlearned people, but, as Bishop Marsh asserts, "not only by the clergy in general, but even by professors in the University." Whitby's Examen is a specimen of the current opinions, which more than insinuated that this New Testament "exposed the Reformation to the Papists, and religion itself to the atheists." Whitby was more unreasonable than Owen; but Mill was removed from the scene before the Examen appeared; the Master "had hidden him in his pavilion from the strife of tongues." Bentley, in his most masterly exposition of such folly, throws out the challenge, "Make your thirty thousand as many more, and even put them into the hands of a knave or a fool, and yet with a most sinistrous and absurd choice he shall not extinguish the light of a single chapter, nor so disguise Christianity, but that every feature of it will still be the same."² Even John Selden was so far

¹ Burk's Life of Bengel, English Free-thinking, by Phileleutherus, translation, p. 237, London, 1837. Lipsiensis, Works, vol. III., p. 360,

² Remarks upon a late Discourse of ed. Dyce, London, 1838.

carried away as to counsel, "when you meet with several readings of the text, take heed you admit nothing against the tenets of your church."¹ Samuel Clark, in his Divine Authority of the Holy Scripture, London, 1760, maintains the divine authority of the Hebrew vowels, points, and accents, or else "we are left to human authority."

These occurrences are not solitary examples. As the attempt to secure a text that might be a near approach to the autographs of the sacred writers—a work of all others most momentous and indispensable, has created dismay and apprehension, so the effort to revise a translation has excited similar antipathy and panic. To tell the truth about the original text has been stigmatized as the inglorious utterance of secrets which should have been hushed up, or told in whispers to a select and initiated circle. The effort to make a translation more faithful by means of a better text, and a thorough and uniform application of grammatical canons, has, even in these days, drawn forth earnest deprecation of the work as useless, if not pernicious; and solemn appeals have been made by all that is patriotic and Christian, by all that concerns the welfare of the church and the land, to lay it aside. The perfection of Scripture has in some way come to be associated with the English Authorized Version, so that to touch it is to injure it, and to attempt to amend it is little less than profanity.

Numerous scholars, critics, and commentators have expressed their opinion as to the desirableness, if not the necessity, of a revision: such men as Lowth, Waterland, Kennicott, White, Blayney, Hales, and many others. Indeed the attempt to secure a revision is no novelty. The need of it has been often felt. The era of the Commonwealth, besides being a time of political convulsion, was a season of great religious and theological excitement. The English Bible at such a period naturally drew earnest attention to itself, for church and divinity overmastered all minds, and were everywhere and always the centre of earnest discussion and controversy. It brought back the older period in the church, when knots of people in the streets of Constantinople debated incomprehensible abstractions, and were so ab-

¹ Table Talk, p. 11, Pickering, London, 1847.

sorbed that they could only carry on a disjointed conversation on common topics; when men talked theology over their daily bargains; when a query about the price of a loaf brought out the reply that "the Father is greater than the Son"; and when one asking for a bath was met with the response, "The Son of God was created from nothing."

In a sermon preached before the House of Commons in August, 1645, Dr. Lightfoot urged them "to think of a review and survey of the translation of the Bible," that "the three nations might come to understand the proper and genuine study of the Scriptures, by an exact, vigorous, and lively translation."¹

In April, 1653, an order was made by the Long Parliament, and a bill was brought in, for a new translation of the Bible out of the original tongues, and it ran in these terms:—²

"Whereas in the original text of the Holy Scriptures there is so great a depth, that only by degrees there is a progress of light towards the attaining of perfection of the knowledge in the bettering of the translation thereof; and hence the most learned translators have found cause again and again of revision and still rectifying and amending within a few years of what they themselves had translated and published. And this hath been the commendable practice even of some Papists, and of sundry of the reformed religion:

"And it being now above forty years since our new translation was finished, divers of the heads of colleges and many other learned persons (that coming later have the advantage to stand as on the heads of the former) in their public sermons (and in print also) have often held out to their hearers and readers that the Hebrew or Greek may better be rendered, as they mention, than as it is in our newest and best translation: some of the places seeming to be very material, and crying aloud for the rectifying of them, if the truth be as it is so affirmed, and published by them, and here in some MSS. presented to us:

"And forasmuch as the translation by Mr. H. Ainsworth of

¹ Works, vol. I, p. xv, ed. Pitman, London, 1825.

² The preamble is given on p. 271.

Moses and the Psalms, and Song of Solomon, is greatly commended by many of the learned as far more agreeable to the Hebrew than ours; and it is said that there are MSS. of his translations of some other Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament. And also in other parts of the Holy Scriptures, some have translated verses and some chapters; and we hear that some have translated the New Testament, if not the Old also, and would have them printed and published in our nation. Which if it should be done on their own heads, without due care for the supervising thereof by learned persons sound in the fundamentals of the Christian religion, might be a precedent of dangerous consequence, emboldening other to do the like, and might tend at last to bring in other Scriptures or another Gospel instead of the oracles of God and the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ:

"For the reforming, rectifying, and repairing of the former injury to the new translation, and for preventing of so great inconveniences of such dangerous consequence, and for the furtherance (what in us lieth) and the benefit and edification of many, Be it enacted, that no person or persons whatsoever within the dominions of England, Scotland, and Ireland, without the approbation of persons hereafter named or to be named by authority, shall presume to print or publish any such translation of the Bible or of the New Testament.

"And that these persons, viz.: Dr. John Owen, Dr. Ralph Cudworth, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. William Greenhill, Mr. Samuel Slater, Mr. William Cowper, Mr. Henry Jessey, Mr. Ralph Venninge, and Mr. John Row, Hebrew professor in Aberdeen, in Scotland,¹ shall be and hereby are constituted, appointed, and authorized in and about all these particulars following to be performed by them in the fear of the Lord, for the good of His people, namely:—

"That these or any three or more of them may search and observe wherein that last translation appears to be wronged by the Prelates, or printers, or others; that in all such places, as far as in them is, it may be rectified and amended therein, and the evident and most material failings, that do in a special

¹ Prof. Row's proposals may be seen on p. 322.

manner call for reformation (some particulars whereof to us have been presented for consideration), and that this may be performed with all speed before there be any further printing of the Bible :

"And further, because it is our duty to endeavour to have the Bible translated in all places as accurately and as perfectly agreeing with the original Hebrew and Greek as we can attain unto, to remove (whatever in us lieth) the stumbling-blocks and offence of the weak, or the cavils of others when they hear in sermons preached or printed, or in other treatises, that the original bears it better thus and thus. Be it [enacted] that the persons beforesaid may seriously consider the translation of Mr. H. Ainsworth, and of any other translations, annotations, or observations made or that may be made by any of themselves, or of any others that they know of, or may confer withal (who are desired to add unto them their best assistance for the general good of all), and consider of the marginal readings in Bibles, whether any of them should rather be in the line. And what they, after serious looking up to the Lord for His gracious assistance in so weighty a work, and advising together amongst themselves, shall judge to be nearest to the text, and to the mind of the Lord, they may give thereunto their approbation, and this with all speed that conveniently they are able:

"And be it further enacted, that Dr. Thomas Goodwin, Dr. Tuckney, and Mr. Joseph Caryl, are hereby appointed and authorized to be supervisors of what is so approved, and that what those persons shall so approve of, shall accordingly be printed and published for the general edification and benefit of the whole nation, to be read both privately and in the public congregations."

The project was revived afterwards, and referred to a sub-committee to consult with Walton, S. Clarke, Cudworth, and "such others as they shall think fit to consider of the translations and impressions of the Bible, and to offer their opinions thereon to this committee." The matter was committed to Lord^{*}Commissioner Whitelocke, who held the Great Seal, and the committee met often at his house. "Excellent and learned observations" were made on some mistakes in the

Bible, "which yet was agreed to be the best of any translation in the world, and pains took in it; but it became fruitless by the Parliament's dissolution."

But now may we not have a better text after a collation of many MSS. not known in the days of King James, and after the labours of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and others, the critical apparatus of Dean Alford, the collation of Scrivener, and the New Testament of Drs. Westcott and Hort not yet completed—the labour of more than twenty years?¹ We have seen what kind of text was used by King James's revisers, and that it has no great authority. Bentley styles the great printer and editor "Pope Stephens," and sarcastically remarks that "his text stands as if an apostle was his compositor." The principles advocated by Bentley, and adopted by Lachmann, are now virtually espoused by editors of the Greek Testament. Tischendorf tells that "after long wavering" he substantially adopted them.² His third edition (1849) and his seventh (1859) differ in considerably more than 1,200 places, about a half of those in the latter returning to the Textus Receptus; and the text of his last or eighth edition differs from

¹ The British and Foreign Bible Society, which issues daily from London and its foreign depots, 8,500 copies of the Bible or portions of it, binds all its translators throughout the world to take the Elzevir edition of 1624, which was reprinted for them in 1852; allowing however such variations as may be found in the marginal renderings of the English version. This noble institution has in this way declared the Elzevir text "authentic," and done for it what the Council of Trent did for the Vulgate. What is commonly called the "Received Text" is chiefly that of Stephens and Beza. The unknown editor states in his preface, 1633, that it was a "text received by all," and the eulogy

helped to fulfil its own pretension. To keep a verse, the genuineness of which nobody familiar with the principles of critical evidence will admit, is to circulate a forgery in the divine name, and is as perilous as to exclude a verse which has every sanction. A collation of Stephens, 1550, and Elzevir, 1624, may be seen in Prebendary Scrivener's *Novum Testamentum*, Cambridge, 1872.

² See also Tregelles in the Introductory Notice to the First Part of his New Testament, 1857; the clear and compact preface of Westcott and Hort to their edition, 1870; and Ellis's *Bentleia Critica*, Cambridge, 1862.

that of the seventh in 3,350 places. This apparent instability partly induced by his love for his own MS., was also caused by his intense and manifest desire to find out the truth by the careful weighing of evidence of all kinds. The theory of Lachmann commends itself, for it finds the text in the oldest authorities, which reach nearest apostolic times, or to the so-called Western authorities, now *κ* and *β*, the Curetonian Syriac and the unrevised old Latin texts, with *A, C, D, &c.*; the Memphitic and the Vulgate; while such Fathers as Origen, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement, and Eusebius, are not to be overlooked. The text of Tregelles is made on hard and fast principles, applied with rigour, so that little account is taken of any collateral influences that may prompt and mould a sound critical judgment. Griesbach's text rests also on Western authorities, or what he called the Western "Recension" or "Family," the received text having come chiefly from the Eastern or Byzantine Family. If certainty as to the text cannot be obtained from diplomatic sources, the highest probability must be the guide, after the evidence of MSS., patristic quotations and versions some of them older than any MS., the special style of the author, the temptations of copyists, the connection of the context, and other minute modifying elements, have been calmly and patiently weighed; each sphere of proof having its own value in proportion to its history and character. Or the source of the variations may be discovered, and themselves gradually traced; or the readings may be in a state of such confusion that to unravel the tangled mass is a work of special tact and delicacy. Or the mass of the Cursives may be ranged against a few Uncials; or the versions may be in conflict with MSS., while the polemical influences of some Father may be very transparent in his citations. Clauses may disappear that had been generally accepted, peculiar alterations may startle, readings may be brought in which have been unknown to the English reader, favourite texts may pass out or appear in some different form; but truth must be followed for its own sake and at all hazards. Let us look at some of the changes which rest on undoubted authority, and which are now found in the best critical editions of the Greek text.

Few readers will quarrel with the change, Matt. vi, 1, "Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men," and of that righteousness, alms, fasting, and prayer are given as examples; or xvii, 4, where Peter says, "I will make here three tabernacles," so like himself; or with the additional word in Luke xv, 17, "I perish here with hunger"; and 22, "bring quickly the best robe"; or Acts xvi, 7, "the spirit of Jesus suffered them not"; or Rom. iv, 1, "our forefather"; v, 1, "let us have peace"; or 2 Tim. iv, 14, "the Lord will reward him"; or James iv, 12, "thou, who art thou that judgest another?" or 1 Peter iii, 15, "sanctify the Lord Christ in your hearts"; or 1 John iii, 1, "that we should be called the sons of God, and we are such"; or, Rev. xix, 1, "I heard as it were a great voice." Nor would some omissions be at all distressing, as that of Matt. i, 25, "till she brought forth a son," "firstborn" standing in Luke undisputed; or v, 22, "whoso is angry with his brother shall be in danger"—"without cause," having no authority, weakens the precept in terseness and spirit; or the omission of "openly" in vi, 4; the substitution of "wine" for "vinegar" in xxvii, 34; or of "as snow" in Mark ix, 3; or the omission of "implacable," Rom. i, 31; of the last clause of viii, 1, "who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit," which is taken from verse 4; and xiv, 9, of "rose, and revived"; or 1 Cor. xi, 29, of the adverb "unworthily," "eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, as he does not discern the Lord's body"; or Gal. iii, 1, which should read, "O foolish Galatians, who bewitched you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was evidently set forth, crucified"; or, Rev. v, 8, "and they reign on the earth," for "they shall reign."

The reason of the following unwarranted emendations is very apparent: Luke ii, 33, "Joseph and his mother," the true reading being "his father and his mother," a mode of speech that might seem to impugn the doctrine of the incarnation; John vi, 11, "Jesus took the loaves, and gave thanks, and gave to them that were set down," the intermediate clause, "he distributed to the disciples, and the disciples to them that were set down," must be left out—it was inserted to bring the verse into correspondence with Mark. The better reading in

John iii, 25, is "a question between some of John's disciples and a Jew." The shorter and more difficult reading is usually the genuine reading.

But the object of textual criticism is not to supply readings that may not be displeasing, or that may be reckoned improvements. No notion of such a kind can be entertained, for its purpose is to find out fact and truth apart from personal preference or dissatisfaction. The evidence that carries in readings that are liked may and does introduce others that may stumble and perplex. No doubt it will distress some persons to find the familiar doxology of the Lord's Prayer omitted, though it does not occur in Luke, and the third and fourth verses of John v left out, or Acts viii, 37, or the last clause of 1 Cor. vi, 20, reading simply, "in your bodies," without the addition, "and your spirit, which are God's." For the famous passage about the three witnesses in 1 John, no one now contends. Other changes may offend some, as if they should find only two lines in the natal anthem, "Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth among men of good will." But, in fact, there are various readings in nearly every verse, though many of them scarcely affect the translation. Variations of nouns and personal pronouns, of position in the names of Christ, and of prepositions and particles, are perpetually occurring. Scribes often added explanatory words, and words for the sake of emphasis. Clauses are taken into Matthew from the other gospels, and parallel passages are brought into verbal coincidence. It is not easy to account for the interpolated insertion in some copies, Matt. xxvii, 49, of a verse from John xix, 34, for the piercing of Christ's side, as told in the latter gospel, took place after death, as Origen also mentions. The following are specimens of words added for the sake of supposed clearness: John xi, 41, "from the place where the dead was laid"; xvi, 16, "because I go to my Father"; Ephes. iii, 14, "of our Lord Jesus Christ"; Col. i, 14, "through his blood"; 2 Thess. ii, 4, "as God"; 1 Tim. iii, 3, "not greedy of filthy lucre"—a conformity to Titus i, 7; 1 Tim. vi, 5, "from such withdraw thyself"; Heb. xii, 20, "or thrust through with a dart." Those clauses have not the ring of the true

metal. At the same time, many cases defy a perfect solution, and scholars take different views. It is very hard to decide on the true reading in John i, 18, whether it should be "the only begotten Son," or "God only begotten";¹ whether it should be, Acts xx, 28, "Church of God," or, "Church of the Lord, which he hath purchased with his own blood."² "God manifest in the flesh," 1 Tim. iii, 16, has less authority than "who was manifest in the flesh."³ The genuineness of the appendix to St. Mark in the last twelve verses of that gospel, and of the story of the woman caught in adultery in St. John, is not freely and generally accepted.

The proper reading in Rom. iv, 19, contradicts the present or current one only in appearance, "and being not weak in faith, he considered not his body now dead, . . . neither yet

¹ May it not be conjectured that the Evangelist wrote simply *μονογενής*, as in v. 14, "the only begotten," and that one scribe, looking back to v. 1, supplied *θεός*, and another, glancing only at v. 14, "only begotten of the Father," naturally wrote *υἱός*. See a learned and vigorous paper in defence of *θεός* by Dr. Hort, of Cambridge, and one equally learned and vigorous on behalf of *υἱός* by Professor Ezra Abbott, of Harvard University, United States.

² Though the Sinaitic Codex has in John i, 18, *θεός*, and *θεοῦ* in Acts xx, 28, Tischendorf does not admit of these readings, and Dr. Davidson concurs. Nor did he, nor could he, follow it in 1 Cor. xv, 51, for it reads "we shall all sleep, but we shall not all be changed." He forsakes it also in Luke iv, 44, and reads, "synagogues of Galilee" instead of "synagogues of Judæa," the last and the more difficult reading being well supported. Tregelles also does not venture to accept it.

³ The readings, *θεός* and *ὁ*, may be traced from *ὁς*: the first taking up into itself the antecedent which may have been thought too vague or remote; and the second laying immediate hold on *μυστήριον* as a near antecedent. Though the result is not affected by the Alexandrian Codex in the British Museum, its reading has been inspected with every care, but without a unanimous decision. This leaf of the MS. is now frail, for it has often been subjected to scrutiny of all kinds. Bishop Ellicott affirms that A reads *ὁς* "indisputably, after minute personal inspection"; but Dr. Scrivener replies in direct contradiction, and he possesses eyes which, in his own words, "have something of the power and too many of the defects of a microscope." The question is whether the bar across the *Θ* is or is not the sagitta of an *Є* on the opposite side of the page. Young, Huish, and others who examined the MS. long ago, agreed that the reading was *ΘЄ*, that is *θεός*, God.

the deadness of Sarah's womb"; the better sustained reading is, "and not being weak in faith, he considered his own body now become dead . . . and the deadness of Sarah's womb, yet he wavered not through unbelief." The first and feebler form is, he did not think of his age and that of Sarah, when he laid hold of the promise; and the second and more suggestive form is, that though he was fully alive to his own age and that of Sarah, still he grasped the promise. The one view makes his age a matter of indifference to him, but the other makes it a conscious difficulty, over which he nobly triumphed. The true reading in Matt. xix, 16, 17, is "Master, what good thing shall I do that I may inherit life? And he said unto him, Why askest thou me concerning the good thing? One there is who is good." The common reading stands in Mark x, 17, and in Luke xviii, 18. An important change happens in 1 Cor. viii, 7, which now reads "for some with conscience of the idol unto this hour, eat it as a thing offered unto a idol." The term rendered "conscience" must pass out, and another meaning "custom" is rightly put in its place—"some from custom in respect to the idol," or "some from being used until now to the idol, eat it as a thing sacrificed to an idol."¹ A necessary change in 2 Cor. iv, 6, will not stumble any one, instead of "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts," it should be, "for it is God that said light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts." 1 John v, 13, reads, "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God"; the better and simpler reading being, "These things have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life, to wit, unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God."²

But the English translation itself may be revised and brought to be as far as possible the express image of the original Greek, and within certain limits such a work may be successfully

¹ *συνήθεια* for *συνείδησις*.

The Words of the New Testament,

² See an excellent and popular view of the subject of various readings in

by Professors Milligan and Roberts, Edinburgh, 1873.

carried out. A revision is not a new translation, such as some men have contended for,¹ nor is it a mere modernizing of the style, like many specimens given to the world, neither is it an attempt to remove difficulties, or solve discrepancies, by renderings so cautiously or cunningly moulded as to suit such a purpose. A revision may and ought to preserve the quaintness and beauty of the English version, and it will not attempt to sew a piece of cloth on an old garment, forming an unseemly and incongruous patch. To present a popular as well as a literal version is no doubt a task of uncommon difficulty.² A literal version for scholars or for private study would be a comparatively easy work; but one for the use of the people requires the nice combination of many qualities, as correctness, clearness, rhythm, and strength—for it must not be rugged on the plea of exactness, or graceful at the expense of fidelity. It should bear a close relation to the original, "just as a cast from a fine statue is better than an imitation." It must be lucid without any paraphrastic dilution, and nervous without inversions or the use of unfamiliar terms. It behoves to be at once true to the original, and loyal to the English idiom, expressing the mind and thought of the author in his own manner. The attempt to follow in all cases the order of the Greek words would produce a cumbrous and awkward translation, especially as emphatic terms do not occupy the same position in Greek and English

¹ The Rev. Alfred Dewes, A.M., speaking any other language than his own, I shall treat him with no respect whatever; but if he speaks in his own language, I shall set him on my head." "I've got him in Italian," said the barber, "but I don't understand him." "Nor would it be well that you should," replied the curate: "and we would never have found fault with the captain if he had never brought him into Spain, and turned him into a Castilian, for he has in this way robbed him of much of his natural excellence (valor)." Don Quijote, cap. VI.

² "If," said the curate (*el cura*), surveying the library of the Cavalier of La Mancha, "if I find Ariosto

clauses. In a word, the present version came to be what it is from frequent revision. The original version of Tyndale, five times revised, is our present New Testament. Between the Bishops' and it, only forty-three years elapsed, and during the eighty-five years from Tyndale's first edition in 1526 to 1611, there were several revisions. But no formal or systematic revision has taken place since 1611, or for more than two centuries and a half. Some of the preceding pages show that the version has been again and again altered in many ways, but not by any joint process, or by any known or recognized company. So that the revision of the Authorized Version does not cast any discredit on it. Who would not wish a Greek text as perfect as possible, and a version as exact as possible? but the perfection of the one and of the other is only to be reached by slow degrees and earnest labour on the part of all willing and scholarly spirits.

The very same objections brought against a revision in 1872-6 did similar service against the revision in 1608-11.

Lord Shaftesbury has produced the economic objection, that many Bibles now in circulation would be rendered useless, and no small amount of money lost. Such fictitious alarm might have been raised over the Great Bible in 1540, the Bishops' in 1568, and the current version in 1611. No revision will at once supersede present copies. Its circulation can only be gradual, and those who possess them will still read and reverence them. The late Lord Panmure, at a public meeting in Edinburgh, January 10, 1857, solemnly declared, "that the project of a new version is fraught with the utmost danger to the Protestant liberties of this country, if not to the Protestant religion itself." Surely an assertion so hastily made is a libel on Protestantism, which is born of the light, and ought to welcome the light in its fullest lustre. On the one hand it is argued, that revision will not lead to any alteration in the articles of the church, and is therefore needless. If the errors and inaccuracies are so slight as is pleaded, then the slighter they are they can be the more easily removed; and why should anything inaccurate, small even as a jot or a tittle, be suffered to remain in the English Bible? Why dishonour it

by the perpetuation of any thing admitted on all hands to be wrong? Ought not the Book of Life to be without spot or blemish? or, as Symonds asked in 1789, "Is error so valuable an inheritance that it ought not to be relinquished? Can it be sanctioned by the plea of a long prescription?" On the other hand, Dr. Cumming, the well known expounder of prophecy, warns against revision, "as it will give the advantage to heterodox parties in the religious world." But does orthodoxy depend on mistranslations or an unrevised version? The late Albert Barnes of Philadelphia, who has written voluminous expositions of the books of the New Testament, condemns revision, and yet practises it on every page of his Commentaries, amending the translation or showing where it wants point and vigour. A systematic revision is surely better than one which is spasmodic and intermittent in character. Dr. McCaul in his "Reasons for Holding Fast," &c., says the "changing of obsolete words would establish a principle that words not intelligible to the general reader must be altered"; and one may ask, Why not? His fear that in this way our theological nomenclature and our theology itself might be altered, haunted him like a dark spectre. If Scripture has in it words not understood, it is so far defective and cannot serve its purpose of a clear teacher, and the dreaded radical revolution cannot be produced by a cause so slight, as the substitution of a few terms so simple as to be "known and read of all men." If the present theology rests on the pillars of old and ambiguous words, it will not need a Samson to shake the temple into ruin. "Wait," say some waverers, "till there be agreement among scholars and critics, till at least a Greek text be fixed or accepted by all." Such a period may never come, critics will be divided in opinion on readings and their evidence, and scholars will admit the necessity of alternative renderings. Yet without this unanimity, there may be such a general harmony as erudition warrants, and experience may confirm.¹

¹ In 1787 was witnessed a strange controversy on Bible translation, two Protestants, one of them a clergyman of the Established Church when Dr. Geddes, a Catholic priest, of England, Dr. Vicesimus Knox, fought a battle in favour of it against

One special objection against revision, that any change will unsettle the minds of the people, refutes itself. For do not the people hear clauses and verses often re-translated in the pulpit; are they not accustomed to such changes made with reason and without it in a variety of ways? No one will call the version perfect; but the drift of such objections is, that if there be inaccuracies in the English Bible, it is better that the people should not know the fact lest they should be disturbed in mind. In the same spirit a stout opponent of revision has written, "At all events, all the necessary alterations in the text of the Authorized Version may be introduced into it by men of wisdom and judgment, without nine-tenths of the nation being aware of it. Would it not, therefore, be far better to do so, if it is to be done?"¹ Another bar to revision has been thrown up in this form, that if more versions than one be in circulation, "the right of private judgment would be destroyed, and people would pin their faith to this or that minister." But from the publication of Matthew's Bible in 1537, down to about 1640, more versions than one were always in use and circulation, and the better translation soon found its way to supremacy. The two versions supposed to be most in antagonism had much in common.

Some cry in dismay at revision, "We know not what may be forced upon us." Nothing will be forced upon anybody. "Must we lose our present beloved Bible, which we read at our mother's knee?" Surely not; the Authorized Version will not be suppressed in any sense or form? Others have objected in scorn, "Churchmen and Dissenters will not coalesce"; the easy reply is, "Come and see." A Revision of the Telegu and Tamil Scriptures has been carried out in India by scholars of the Episcopalian and Nonconformist churches; and the same work is going on in the same way in Caffraria, in Madagascar, and in China, all exhibiting the unity of the Spirit as they work on His book. Revision has been

¹ Vindication of the Authorized Rev. S. C. Malan, M.A., p. 346, Version of the English Bible, by London, 1856.

done, or is going on in Sweden, Holland,¹ and Germany,² and some revised versions have been published. "Ah! but the Bible will be so changed that we shall not be able to recognize it!" No such result may be anticipated.

"We must not stint,
Our necessary actions in the fear,
To cope malicious censurers.
If we stand still,
For fear our motions will be mocked or carped at,
We should take root here where we sit, or sit
State statues only."

But it is all the while to be remembered that it is difficult to accept any great changes in words so familiar—familiar as the sunbeam, and like the sunbeam welcome every morning, as those of the English Bible. Four times in its history has this very obstacle been felt, and it has been always surmounted. The new at length gained on acquaintance, and as the novelty wore off it became as an old friend, not taken to kindly at first, but beloved and cherished as he is better known. Again and again the alarmists and the alarmed alike have had verified to them the image of the hymn,

"The clouds ye so much dread,
Are big with mercy, and shall fall
In blessings on your head."

It would serve little purpose to enumerate or criticize the many specimens of revised or new translations of the New Testament which have appeared from time to time. Too many of them have been of a peculiar character, and though not without merit, they want some element that should belong

¹ Het Nieuwe Testament of alle Grieksche taal in onze Nederlandsche Boeken des nieuwen Verbonds van getrouwelijk overgezet. Te Londen, onzen Heer Jezus Christus, door last 1873.

² Das Neue Testament unser, Herrn und Heilandes Jesu Christi, nach Dr. Martin Luther's Uebersetzung. Revidirte Ausgabe. Berlin, 1872.

MDCXIX, uit de oorspronkelijke

to a popular and accurate version. Reference might be made to the volumes of Purver, Scarlett, Harwood, Wakefield, Worsley, Newcome, Whiston, M'Ray, Boothroyd, Wynne, Ainslie, Highton, Rotherham, Blackwood, Granville Penn, Webster, the Improved Version (Unitarian), and that of the American Bible Union (Baptist). A few samples may suffice.

One peculiarity of Scarlett's volume is that the words of different speakers in a chapter are marked off and printed as in a drama :—

"*Hist.*—Then Jesus going from thence, retired to the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. And behold, a woman of Canaan coming out of these parts, cried, saying to him,

"*Canaanitish Woman.*—Have pity on me, O Lord, thou son of David; my daughter is grievously possessed by a demon :

"*Hist.*—But he answered her not a word. And his disciples coming, entreated him, saying,

"*Disciples.*—Dismiss her, because she crieth after us.

"*Hist.*—But he answering, said,

"JESUS.—I am not sent, save to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

"*Hist.*—Then she came and fell prostrate before him, saying,

"*Canaanitish Woman.*—Lord, help me !

"JESUS.—It is not fit to take the children's bread, and throw it to the dogs.

"*Hist.*—And she said,

"*Canaanitish Woman.*—True, Lord : yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table.

"*Hist.*—Then Jesus answering, said to her,

"JESUS.—O woman, thy faith is great ! be it to thee according to thy desire.

"*Hist.*—And her daughter was healed from that hour."

Purver gives a very long list of words "superannuated and not fit to be used in the English Bible"; but in that list are many vivid and current terms as fresh as when they came from the mint.

Mr. Ray, or M'Ray—a man of some scholarship, and of no small vanity and loquacity—lived in Glasgow, and here is a sample of his work :—

"Therefore, when he was gone out, Jesus said, Now is the Son of man glorified, (*destroying the works of the devil,*) and God is (*thereby*) glorified in him. If God be glorified in him, God will also glorify him with himself, (*by making him sit at his right hand,*) and shall straightway glorify him. Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go ye cannot (*now*) come; so I say now unto you."

Herman Heinfetter has translated the Vatican MS. as it could be had at the time,¹ from the collations of Bartolucci, of Birch, of Bentley through the Abbate Mico, and of the Abbate Rulotta. But though he had had Tischendorf's edition of 1867, or the fac-simile edition of Vercellone, it would not have been of any great moment. Some of his renderings may be quoted :

Matt. i, 20, "Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her exists without blemish to her reputation."

Eph. iii, 17, "For the inner man to dwell in the Christ by means of the faith that exists in your hearts."

Heb. ii, 5, "For unto angels' *assurances*, hath he not put in subjection *man's knowledge* of the world to come."

1 Pet. ii, 2, "As newborn babes desire the reasonably sincere milk of *brotherly love* that ye may grow thereby *unto salvation*."

Griesbach's text has been translated by Nathan Hale (Boston, 1836), by a layman, Edgar Taylor (London, 1840), and by Samuel Sharpe (6th edition, London, 1870).

The text of Tischendorf's last edition has been translated, with scholarly care and great exactness and fidelity, by Samuel Davidson, D.D. (London, 1875).

Tischendorf's text, but taken from various editions, had been translated by G. R. Noyes, D.D., Harvard University, 1868. The English version is often good, but too often free, as may be seen in the examples adduced by Dr. Davidson in the Introduction to his own New Testament.

Joseph B. Rotherham has translated the text of Tregelles,

¹ *A nom de plume*, London, 1864.

as far as it was published, and furnished his version with marks pointing out the emphatic words (London, 1872).

Mr. Darby's anonymous translation is often excellent, though the various readings mentioned are treated very curtly, and the English is occasionally rough.

The Baptist translation of the American Bible Union merits commendation in many respects, though it is more than faithful to antipædobaptist opinions. It professedly makes the Bible the book of a sect. And we have such renderings as these: Matt. iii, 1, "John the immerser"; xxi, 25, "John's immersion, whence was it? from heaven or from men?" Acts xix, 3, "Unto what were ye immersed? and they said, Unto John's immersion. John indeed immersed with the immersion of repentance"; Rom. vi, 4, "buried with him by the immersion into his death." But the verb is rendered in Luke xii, 50, "I have an immersion to undergo"; and the meaning of the preposition is fallen from, almost of necessity, in 1 Cor. i, 13, "or were ye immersed in the name of Paul?" and similarly in Matt. xxviii, 19, "into the name" being the right translation.

A person of the name of Mace published a New Testament in 1729, and Lewis gives a few of its peculiar renderings: Matt. vi, 16, "When ye fast, don't put on a dismal air as the hypocrites do"; xi, 17, "if we play a merry tune you are not for dancing; if we act a mournful part you are not in the humour"; xii, 34, "'tis the overflowing of the heart that the mouth dischargeth"; xx, 31, "the people reprimanded them to make them hold their tongue, but they bawl'd out the more, Have mercy on us"; xxii, 34, "the Pharisees hearing that he dumb-founded the Sadducees"; Mark x, 34, "they will treat him with ignominy, subject him to the lash"; xiv, 65, "and the domestics slapt him on the cheeks"; Luke x, 37, "He replied, the doctor who took pity on him"; xvii, 27, "eating and drinking, marriages and matches, was the business"; John i, 23, "I am, said he, the voice of one crying in the wilderness, 'Clear the way of the Lord"; 1 Cor. vii, 36, "If any man thinks it would be a reflection upon his manhood to be a stale batchelor"; 1 Thess. v, 5, "You inherit the

advantages of meridian light: we are not involved in the obscurity of night"; 13, "Don't form any brigues against them"; 14, "Comfort the pusillanimous"; James ii, 3, "If you should respectfully say to the suit of fine clothes, Sit you there, that's for quality"; iii, 5, 6, "The tongue is but a small part of the body, yet how grand are its pretensions! A spark of fire! what quantities of timber will it blow into a flame! The tongue is a brand that sets the world in a combustion: it is but one of the numerous organs of the body, yet it can blast whole assemblies: tipp'd with infernal sulphur, it sets the whole train of life in a blaze."

"A new and corrected version of the New Testament; or, a minute revision, and professed translation of the original histories, memoirs, letters, prophecies, and other productions of the evangelists and apostles was published since by Rodolphus Dickenson, Boston (U.S), 1833." Specimens of the translation are, Luke ii, "And it happened, that when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the embryo was joyfully agitated, and Elizabeth was pervaded by the Holy Spirit; and she exclaimed with a loud voice, and said, Blessed are you among women! and blessed is your incipient offspring! And whence is this occurrence to me, that the mother of my Lord should visit me? For behold, when the voice of your salutation sounded in my ears, the embryo was enlivened with joy." Acts i, "Moreover, this man, indeed, caused a field to be purchased with the recompense of his iniquity; and falling prostrate, a violent internal spasm ensued, and all his viscera were emitted." xvii, "Paul, then stood in the centre of the court of Areopagus, and remarked; Men of Athens, I perceive that you are greatly devoted to the worship of invisible powers." xxvi, "Festus declared with a loud voice, Paul, you are insane! Multiplied research drives you to distraction." xxviii, "And the Barbarians displayed towards us no ordinary philanthropy."

Noah Webster, the author of the Dictionary, published an edition of the Bible, with amendments of the language—that is, "by the exclusion of all archaisms, and of words deemed below the solemnity and dignity of the subject, by the insertion of euphemisms, with many verbal and grammatical alterations,"

so as to bring it into accordance with the lexicographer's standard of American English. Newhaven, 1833.

Dean Alford issued a revised translation of the New Testament which, though excellent in many points, is of unequal merit, as the work was done in haste; and the critical notes on the Greek text are too vague for the scholar, and too short for the general reader. London, 1870.

Granville Penn published a Revision in 1836, under the title of *The Book of the Covenant of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. Many of his numerous changes are not of great moment.

Macknight's Translation of the Epistles is loose and paraphrastic, and so is Conybeare's, in that deservedly popular volume, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*. Principal Campbell's Translation of the Gospels is not so exact as it should be, though he laid down good rules for a translator. One is that he should avoid vulgarisms and affectations; yet he has himself: Matt. v, 1, "Jesus seeing so great a confluence repaired to a mountain"; v, 3, "Happy the poor who repine not"—an odd neological specimen to be found so near the base of Cairngorm; Luke xviii, 5, "lest she come perpetually, and plague me"; John i, 38, "Rabbi, which signifieth Doctor"; vii, 6, "my time is not yet come, but any time will suit you"; xxi, 5, "my lads, have ye any victuals?" He refers to other two versions, in one of which "Zacharias vented his divine enthusiasm" is read for "he prophesied," and Jesus is called "guaranter of the alliance" for "mediator of the covenant"; "the Lord of the celestial militia" stands for "Lord of hosts," and "the joy of thy Lord" is degraded into "thy master's diversions."

The Religious Tract Society, not long ago, published the Holy Bible arranged in paragraphs and sections, with emendations of the text. The preparation of this fine quarto was the work of more than ten years. The emendations are printed with brackets in the heart of the text.

Tauchnitz's "Thousandth Volume"—the Authorized Version of the New Testament, with an Introduction and some critical notes by Tischendorf, 1869—is a literary curiosity, but its

notes are too few, and also too curt, to be of very great benefit to the common reader.

Reference needs scarcely be made to the well known Revision of some Books of the New Testament by "Five Clergymen." Besides its great merits, it has done the needful work of a pioneer.

Lastly, there appeared (London, 1875) the first volume of a work compactly built together—"The New Testament: a new Translation, on the basis of the Authorized Version, from a critically revised text," &c. By John Brown M'Lellan, M.A., Vicar of Bottisham. This volume, with its symmetrical arrangement on every page of text, marginal and expository remarks, the fruit of great industry, is certainly a marvel of printing, and various forms of letter are employed. For its purity and integrity, he prints the "Received Text," and he puts it far above the very latest and most celebrated critical editions of the New Testament. The volume has also a prefatory apparatus, a Harmony, and a body of Exegetical Notes.

Rules to guide a reviser of the English version are apt to be frigid and mechanical. Newcome laid down fifteen canons in the preface to his "Translation of the Minor Prophets," and he repeated them with some variation, and at greater length, in his "Historical View of the English Biblical Translations." These rules are good; but they belong to the outer and more visible features, and take no cognizance of the minuter lineaments that give soul and character to any translation. The reader is referred to the following works on revision, the product of scholarly ability, and of critical and exegetical experience: Professor Scholefield's "Hints";¹ Archbishop Trench "On the Authorized Version of the New Testament";² Bishop Ellicott's "Considerations on the Revision of the English Version";³ Canon Lightfoot, "On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament."⁴ In these volumes will be found some of the examples quoted in the following pages.⁵

¹ Cambridge, 2nd edition, 1836.

² London, 1858.

³ London, 1870.

⁴ London, 1871.

⁵ For brief biographical sketches of King James's Revisers, see "The Translators Revived," &c., by A. W. M'Clure. New York, 1853.

The two critics referred to in the previous chapter have now passed away, each having left his work to some extent unfinished. The learned and laborious Constantine von Tischendorf¹ died in December, 1874, and the conscientious and painstaking Samuel Prideaux Tregelles died in April, 1875. It has been stated that Tischendorf was greatly swayed by the Sinaitic MS.; and to show what fascination it occasionally exerted upon him, it may be added that he excludes the last verse of St. John's Gospel (xxi, 25) solely because in that manuscript it appeared to be written with fresher or darker ink. Other eyes than his could not appreciate the difference "*coloris discrimen*," and when he showed the page to Tregelles, the English scholar at once exclaimed, "O yes, I see; the scribe took a new dip of ink after writing verse 24th."

¹ By an imperial ukase he was, in 1869, elevated to the rank of a hereditary noble of the Russian empire —an honour recognized by his own government.

CHAPTER LI.

AFTER all that has been said in the previous pages in merited praise of the Authorized Version as the work of careful conscientious scholars, it is not perfect in all points. There are some inaccuracies and misrenderings; Greek idioms are not always distinctly apprehended, and ambiguities are found. Sometimes the version falls short of the original in terseness and point, and occasionally a different turn is given to the thought. The Greek article is dealt with very capriciously; the shades of relation marked by the genitive are not uniformly noted, and it is rendered several times as an adjective of quality; the time marked by aorists and imperfects is not given in all cases even where the English idiom might allow it; the full meaning of the compound relative and of compound verbs, is not in each place brought out; tertiary predicates sink into mere epithets; the emphasis characterizing the Greek now and then evaporates in the English; prepositions are not in all cases justly distinguished; equivocal senses are given to conjunctions; synonyms are not always skilfully discriminated; the particles have not, in every instance, their due and delicate significance; some terse and brief idiomatic clauses are diluted; the same Greek term has several English renderings, and the same English term stands for several Greek words. Some clauses of the earlier versions had set a bad example, which was heedlessly copied. Italic supplements are now unduly scattered about, many of them "no better than dashes of water thrown into the sincere milk of the word."

Though the English of the version be usually so lucid, there

are some ambiguities—some creases in the Coan gauze which dim its transparency. In Chap. XLIV¹ we have given a list of peculiar words and forms found in the version, some of them obsolete and some of them with a meaning rarely found now, and others may be noted or again referred to in their connection. “Of” no longer means “by”; “spoken of the apostles of our Lord,” Jude 17, where “spoken of” might be readily taken to mean “spoken about.” When “of” really means “from” it is now liable to be misunderstood: “the things I have heard of him,” or “which I have heard of God,” John viii, 26, 40; or “that I have heard of my Father,” xv, 15; “friends of the mammon of unrighteousness,” Luke xvi, 9, should be “out of”; it is not making Mammon your friend, but employing this world’s wealth in a right way, and you shall be benefited by your beneficence. “By” itself is equivocal, for it is sometimes connected with the original cause, and sometimes with the instrumental cause. It might be often rendered “through”—1 Cor. viii, 6, “Jesus Christ, through whom are all things.” “For” often signifies “because,” but it was taken as meaning “in order to” in Rom. iv, 3. The translation, 2 Cor. v, 21, “He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin,” though not liable to be misunderstood, might be easily changed in arrangement; but it is surely a very extreme and unwarranted opinion, that “the verse as it stands clearly, perspicuously, and unequivocally declares the human race to be sinless,² and is a glaring perversion of the original Greek.” Surely no one has ever so taken it, or has been perplexed by it; and such verbal order was far from being uncommon in the days of the translators, the sense being guarded by the punctuation. The position of the words, in instances of a similar kind, might be altered, yet who ever was bewildered by the statement, “and all the people that heard him, and the publicans,” Luke vii, 29; or “there shall a man meet you, bearing a pitcher of water,” xxii, 10; or “Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot, Lord,” John xiv, 22; or “a golden cup in her hand, full of abomina-

¹ P. 208.

of the Church of Scotland, p. 187.

² A Plea for a New English Version of the Scriptures, by a Licentiate

London, 1864.

tion,” Rev. xvii, 4? Amidst all the changes introduced by printers, in so many editions, no one thought of altering the phrase “strain at a gnat,” Matt. xxiii, 24, which was probably a misprint in the first edition for “strain out a gnat,” or rather “strain out the gnat”—“strain out,” the proper translation of the Greek verb, being found in the Bishops’, the Genevan, and older versions. Some, however, suppose that the change was intentional, the sense being, strain the liquor at the appearance of a gnat in it. A solitary edition of 1754 did make the alteration, but it had no followers.

A version ought never, if possible, to present to the ordinary reader a doubtful sense, but an alternative rendering may go into the margin. His question is not what means the Greek text, but what mean those English words?¹

1 Cor. vii, 19, reads thus, “Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God,” and the declaration has sometimes been understood as if the meaning were, the one or the other is nothing but, or nothing else than, or identical with, the keeping of the commandments of God. The clause (1 Tim. i, 17), “the only wise God,” might imply to some readers, that there were other gods, but of them wisdom could not be predicated.

Matt. xxi, 7, seems at first sight quite plain—“and brought the ass and the colt, and put on them their clothes, and they set him thereon,” that is, on the clothes spread over the back of the colt, Mark xi, 2. But the question has been raised, did he not use both animals in succession?

In the first edition Mark x, 18, stands thus: “There is no

¹ It will be scarcely credited, though it is quite true, that the term “band” in the clause, “a centurion of the band called the Italian band,” Acts x, 1, has been misunderstood not above twenty years ago. An English preacher, belonging to a denomination that does not compass the education of all its ministers, took the clause for his text, when he occupied a Presbyterian pulpit, and announced

that his discourse was designed to show the power of divine grace in the conversion of Cornelius. For first, he was a soldier, and military life is not favourable to piety, and, secondly, he was leader of a band or company of foreign musicians, enlarging eloquently on the character of opera singers, many of whom still come from Italy.

man good, but one *that is* God," and it was not changed till 1660.

Matt. v, 16, "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven;" "so" is usually taken to be emphatic: let your light shine so brightly, or in such a way, that others may see. But the "so," or "even so," simply connects the verse with the one before it; "as the lamp gives light to all that are in the house," so, or in like manner, "let your light shine before men."

"No man," is the prevailing translation of a Greek pronoun,¹ and serves the purpose well enough in a variety of places where there is a clear reference to human agents, as Matt. vi, 24, "no man can serve two masters"; or in ix, 16; xx, 7; or in Luke v, 36, 37, 39. But in many clauses "no one" would be the better rendering, and it is found very rarely, as in Mark x, 18, "none good but one"; John xvii, 12, "none of them is lost." "No man" limits the reference in John x, 29, and "man" is printed in the ordinary letters in the first edition. The form "no one" is never used in the Authorized Version. Especially in Luke vi, 38, "men" is an infelicitous insertion, there being no nominative in the original: "good measure pressed down . . . shall they give into your bosom," for the reference is not to any human bestowal of reward. "One" would be often a more appropriate representative of another pronoun than "any man." In some editions, as Fields's, 1666, the reading of John x, 28, is "neither shall any pluck"; and in verse 29, "none is able to pluck."

"The birds of the air have nests," Matt. viii, 20. The translation is not accurate, as the Greek term means only dwelling-places, though in the erroneous popular view a nest is the home of the bird.² But the bird builds its nest and uses it only for incubation, and never haunts it after its

¹ οὐδείς.

² The mistake is a common one. Milton, speaking of beasts and birds returning at night, says—

"They to their grassy couch, these to
their nests
Were slunk."

young are fledged and flown. The nest is not to the bird as the hole is to the fox, a place of usual retreat. "The birds of the air have roosting places" which they frequent. In Matt. viii, 18, 28, "the other side" is vague, and might be rendered, "the other shore of the lake."

"Sat at meat," in Matt. ix, 10, and in other places, suggests an erroneous posture, and might be easily given "reclined at meat."

The "Canaanite," in the phrase "Simon the Canaanite," Matt. x, 4, is incorrectly spelled, and would imply that in some peculiar sense he belonged to Canaan. The true spelling is Cananite; or it might be given as Cananaean, to keep it distinct from the Old Testament form of name belonging to the aborigines. Nor does the epithet mean that he belonged to Cana of Galilee, though some have supposed that his marriage was the scene of Christ's first miracle; the Syro-chaldaic epithet has its Greek equivalent in "Zelotes," Luke vi, 15.

Matt. xii, 10, "And behold there was a man which had his hand withered. And they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath days?"—"him" might, to a careless reader, seem to refer to the invalid.

"Offence," as in Matt. xvi, 23, "thou art an offence unto me"; in Gal. v, 11, "offence of the cross"; and in many other places signifies what causes to stumble. Similarly the verb "offend" often does not mean to give offence, but to cause to offend or to stumble, Matt. v, 29; Rom. xiv, 20, 21. It is rendered correctly in 1 Cor. viii, 13.

Mark xi, 8, "and others cut down branches off the trees, and strawed them in the way"; in John xii, 13, "the people took branches of palm trees." Now palms have no branches proper, and to have thrown common branches on the road would only have given uncertainty to the step of the animal and impeded its progress. The meaning is, they cut the great feathery fronds that form the tufted crown of the tree, and made a layer of them, or littered them, on the road.

Mark xiv, 18, "one of you which eateth with me shall betray me," might be "one of you shall betray me, he that eateth with me"; and similarly in verse 20, "one of the twelve, he

that dippeth with me in the dish." Judas was thus singled out, as he was reclining so near Jesus that the same dish served for both, and out of that dish He gave him the "sop."

The point and beauty of our Lord's reply, Luke ii, 49, to his mother are lost in the present version. "How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business;" the idiomatic words may mean, "wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house." Her demand was not as to his engagements, but as to his place; not what he had been doing, but where he had been. The spirit of his question is, "where is a child to be found but at home, or in his father's house?" The temple was the house of his Father, and he was naturally found in it, and to it, had they fully known his Divine Sonship, they might have come at once in search of him.¹

In Luke iii, 23, the assertion, "and Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age," conveys no definite meaning, the proper rendering being, "and Jesus was about thirty years of age when he began" . . . his public ministry.

Luke iv, 20, "And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister." "Minister" is liable to misinterpretation, and conveys to many ordinary minds a wrong sense, it being supposed to mean the president or teaching elder of the congregation, who, in discharge of his duty, would have read the lesson and addressed the people, had not Jesus taken the work into his own hand. But the minister was simply the officer who had charge of the sacred rolls.

The phrase "as much again," Luke vi, 34, might be taken as in common use, to mean double, the proper rendering being "to receive again as much"; and it is very apt to be forgotten that in the phrase "there shall be weeping," "there" is the local adverb—in that place.

Luke ix, 32, "Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep, and when they were awake they saw his

¹ Esther vii, 9, ἐν τοῖς Ἀμὲν, in *Oratores Attici*, ed. Dobree). See the house of Haman; εἰς τὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ ἐμοῦ, into the house of my brother (Lysias, vol. II, p. 356,

glory"—a rather indistinct rendering, a better translation might be "were heavy with sleep, but having kept awake throughout, they saw his glory."

"Also" is ambiguous in Luke x, 1, "the Lord appointed other seventy also."

In Luke xvi, 8, "the lord" might mean the Saviour, and some have been perplexed by such a meaning, but it is merely the master of the unjust steward—"his lord."¹

Luke xviii, 12, "I give tithes of all that I possess," but only in the perfect does the verb signify to "possess"—I give tithes of all that I acquire. Tithe was taken only of fruit or annual increase, not of money laid up or possessed. The verb is well rendered "provide" in Matt. x, 9, "get" in the margin superseding the "possess" of the older versions, the Genevan having in the margin "provide not for"; and, better still, "obtained" in Acts xx, 28, and it is twice rendered "purchased"—a sense suggested by the context. Nor can it bear the meaning of "possess" in Luke xxi, 19; but it is "in your patience, or patient endurance of these things, ye shall win your souls." The translation of the same verb is also wrong in 1 Thess. iv, 4.

The translation of Luke xxii, 29, 30, is hazy, and might be given with more exactness, "and I appoint unto you, as my Father appointed unto me, a kingdom, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom."

A peculiar and natural touch is found in the right translation of Luke xxii, 56, "and a certain maid seeing him" (Peter) as "he sat in the light," or "at the light"² of the fire, as the gleam of the burning charcoal fell on his face and features, she recognized him.

The meaning of John i, 9, depends on the punctuation, as the participle rendered "which cometh" might agree, as a neuter nominative, with light, or, as an accusative masculine, with man. Similarly, in Matt. xix, 28, where our version, in the first edition, rightly places a comma after "me," and gives

¹ The word is actually spelled 1648. Printed by the Companie of with a capital, as "Lord," in some Stationers.

editions—as in a quarto, London, ² πρὸς τὸ φῶς.

"in the regeneration when," that being the period, "when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory," and when the promised reward shall be bestowed. But the ambiguity in Acts viii, 26, will remain with any rendering of the Greek. Is it Gaza or the way to Gaza which is desert? The solution can be found neither in printing nor translation.

John iv, 9, reads, "the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans," and yet the previous verse affirms that the disciples were at the very time in process of dealing with the Samaritans, having "gone away into the city to buy meat." The verb signifies familiar or friendly intercourse.

John ix, 17, "what sayest thou of him that he hath opened thine eyes?" may be understood in two ways, but there is only one question, and the sense is, What sayest thou of him because, or in that, he opened thine eyes?

John x, 14, 15, the connection between the two verses is obliterated by the punctuation, and it should be, "I know mine own and mine own know me, even as the Father knoweth me and I know the Father."

In the question, "have ye any meat?"¹ (John xxi, 5), the word is used in its English sense of animal food, meaning here "fishes"; hence the injunction at once to cast the net.

In the phrase, Acts iv, 4, "the number of the men was about five thousand," in relation to ii, 41, there is want of clearness, but the proper translation is "the number became, or rose to be, five thousand."

Acts vi, 1 records, "a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews." Our translators meant Grecians to represent Hellenists, and Greeks to represent Hellenes, as in this passage and in ix, 29, and in xi, 20; and in this last place they had Hellenists in their Greek text. But ordinary readers do not readily appreciate the distinctions of Grecians and Greeks, and have wondered that there should have been Gentiles in the Church prior to the conversion either of Cornelius or of the

¹ Meat among the people in Scotland signifies food generally. The Scottish term "kitchen" represents the meaning of the Greek noun ex-

actly, for it signifies whatever is eaten with bread, whether fish, beef, mutton, fowls, or eggs, &c.

Ethiopian eunuch. But both the parties in this case were of Jewish race and blood, the Hebrews being native Jews, and the Grecians Jews born out of Palestine, the distinction of race being Jew and Greek, and of language and birthplace, Hebrew and Hellenist. The foreign Jews murmured that their widows did not receive as much daily dole from the common table as did those of the home-born Jews.

The italic supplement as object to the verb, in Acts vii, 59, is wholly unwarranted—"they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying;" "they stoned Stephen," "invoking and saying Lord Jesus," the Lord Jesus being the direct object of the martyr's invocation.

Acts x, 12, "wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts," literally "all four-footed beasts," a popular mode of description which need not have been corrected.

The apostle begins his address at Mar's hill with these words Acts xvii, 22, "Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious"—it has been often remarked that such a version carries blame in it. But the apostle simply puts aside this charge of being a "setter forth of strange gods," by quietly saying, "Ye men of Athens, I perceive in all things ye carry your devoutness very far"—the proof being that he had seen an altar with an inscription—"to an unknown God." In verse 23, the noun rendered "devotions"—"I beheld your devotions," signifies not devout feeling or attitude, but objects of adoration.

The phrase, "wicked lewdness," in Gallio's speech, Acts xviii, 14, is misleading to modern English readers, as it now has changed its meaning, the sense being here, "evil misdeeds," the idea of sensuality not being in it.

The rendering is ambiguous in Acts xxiii, 27, "this man should have been killed," the meaning being "this man would have been killed, or was on the point of being killed."

Acts xxvi, 28, "Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian. And Paul said, I would to God that not only thou but also all that hear me this day, were both almost and altogether such as I am, except these bonds." Agrippa, filled with Jewish prejudice, had sunk into a Roman

voluptuary, and his utterance is a bitter sneer that reaches its climax in the word "Christian," a contemptuous epithet on the royal tongue. Paul had appealed to him, and expressed his conviction that he was so far on his side as a man believing the prophets, and Agrippa scornfully repels the insinuation, "With small effort art thou persuading thyself to make me a Christian; or, with small persuasion, thou wouldest fain make me a Christian." "I would to God," is the reply, whether with small effort or with great, "not only thou, but also all that hear me this day might become such as I am, except these bonds." The meaning "almost," which cannot be borne out, is from the Genevan and Beza's *propemodum*. Tyndale and the Great Bible had "somewhat thou bringest me in mind for to become a Christian."¹

There is an extraordinary rendering in Acts xxvii, 40, "When they had taken up the rudder bands they committed *themselves* unto the sea;" after the earlier version, the Genevan being as unintelligible, "committed the ship," the sense being, casting loose the anchors they left them in the sea, as in the margin.

A worthy member of a Scottish church court once warned its members not to call their deliberations a "debate," for debate was one of the rank sins condemned by the inspired apostle in Rom. i, 29; but the term there means "strife."

The archaism, 1 Cor. iv, 4, "I know nothing by myself," introduced by Tyndale, will be better given now by "I know nothing against myself." The idiom is old English, as in Webb's Travels,² 1590, "they could find nothing by me;" Cranmer says to Henry VIII, "I am exceedingly sorry that such faults can be proved by the queen," that is, against her. The marginal rendering "day," for the "judgment," in the text of the previous verse is literal. Tyndale has "mans day" in brackets (second edition); and Coverdale has it without them; the other versions, with the exception of the Rheims, having

¹ Chrysostom conjectures that the apostle did not understand what *ἐν ὀλίγῳ* signified, but took it to mean *ἐξ ὀλίγου*. See a long note in Meyer's Commentary on the phrase.

The reading *πείθη*, found in A, is accepted by some for *πείθεις*, found in B, and other authorities.

² P. 30, ed. Arber, London, 1868.

"day." "Day" meant the "day of hearing and deciding a cause"; and "daysman" was one who, as umpire, appointed the day of trial (Job ix, 33).

We have no word to stand for the epithet rendered "natural" in 1 Cor. ii, 14; xv, 44; "psychic" is unintelligible, and "soul-ish" has no meaning.¹

Gal. i, 18, "I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter." To see a person is still a colloquial phrase, meaning to hold an interview with him.

The phrase, "brotherly love," 1 Thess. iv, 9, is not exact, for it may mean either, subjectively, the love felt by a brother, or, objectively, the love which is felt toward a brother.² The last is the true signification,—the love that a brother claims or is entitled to. "Brotherly" love, not because I feel that I am his brother, but brother-love, because I feel that he is my brother.

Philip. iv, 2, 3, "I beseech Euodia, and beseech Syntyche, that they be of the same mind in the Lord. And I intreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel." This translation seems to imply that two sets of persons are referred to—first, the two women who had disagreed, and then the others who had helped in the Gospel; but, as the relative shows, the connection is, "I beseech them to be of the same mind, I entreat thee, also, help them as being women,"³ who laboured with me in the gospel."

The proper translation of Gal. ii, 9, is not "James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars," but who were "reputed pillars"; similarly, James i, 26. The phrase, "an old disciple," applied to Mnason, of Cyprus, in Acts xxi, 16, is inferentially true; for the real meaning is a disciple from the first, like his fellow-Cypriote, Barnabas, converted perhaps at

¹ Psalm cxxiv, 3, "then had they swallowed us up quick," that is, alive; but quick is often there taken as an adverb, or "speedily."

² *Φιλαδελφία* is brother-love. Thus, *φιλαργυρία* is love of silver,

φιλανθρωπία love of man, *φιλοσοφία* love of wisdom, the last part of the compound noun denoting the object of the love.

³ *αἵτινες*, "as being women who."

Pentecost. He may have been one of those "men of Cyprus," who carried the Gospel to Antioch (Acts xi, 26).

"Palace," in Philip. i, 13, suggests a wrong meaning, for the *prætorium* was not the royal residence, but the barracks of the imperial life-guards. A portion of the building was close upon the palace. Josephus distinguishes carefully the one building from the other. The word is rendered in the Gospels and Acts, "judgment hall," "hall of judgment," "common hall," and once unavoidably, "*prætorium*"—"the hall called *prætorium*."

In 1 Tim. iv, 1-3, the clauses are so connected that the English reader is apt to imagine that the "speaking lies" is the work of the devils, but it is the work of those who apostatize and teach the nefarious dogmas—they do it "in the hypocrisy of those who speak lies"—and "doctrines of demons" are not doctrines about those, but teachings prompted by them.

The word "atonement" occurs in Romans v, 11; but its verb is rendered "reconcile" in the previous verse, so that "the reconciliation" would be the clearer rendering.

Rom. iii, 25, "Whom God has set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood"; this punctuation directly connects "in his blood" with "faith," but it may be connected with "propitiation"—a propitiation, through faith, in his blood.

Rom. xi, 21, might be misunderstood as if repentance on the part of man might be dispensed with, and Heb. xii, 17, as if contrition had become an impossibility for Esau.

The term "business," Rom. xii, 11, itself a misrendering, or an archaism,¹ might seem to refer to worldly dealings or industry, and is often so taken; but it refers to spiritual duties.

¹ "Scrip" can scarcely be misunderstood by any one who remembers what is said of David, 1 Sam. xvii, 40, that he put the "smooth stones in a shepherd's bag, even in a scrip," but the word has of late become so current with another meaning, as railways, that its scriptural sense has to many faded away. So that when an intelligent person was asked the other day, "What 'scrip for your journey' must mean?" he replied at once, "Oh, some kind of Oriental promissory note."

In 1 Cor. i, 18, 21, "foolishness of preaching" might be thought to characterize the method of announcement, and not the thing announced—the cross, which appeared "to the Greeks foolishness."

"Dishonesty," in the phrase, "hidden things of dishonesty," 2 Cor. iv, 2, keeps its Latin sense, and means shame, and not secret chicanery or undetected fraudulent dealing.

2 Cor. xii, 16, might sound as if the apostle had really imposed upon the Corinthians "with guile."

Gal. i, 19, "but other of the apostles saw I none save James the Lord's brother," might mean, "I saw Peter, and none other of the apostles did I see, but I saw James the Lord's brother"—the inference being that James was not an apostle; or the sense might be "none other of the apostles did I see except James the Lord's brother"—the inference in that case being that James was an apostle.

The clause, "spiritual wickedness in high places," Eph. vi, 12, has been referred by other parties than Puritans and Covenanters to the hierarchy and the Court, the true rendering being "in heavenly places."

In the phrase, "the prize of the high calling," Philip. iii, 14, the epithet "high" naturally but wrongly suggests the quality of the calling and not its origin.

The clause in Col. iii, 8, "But now you¹ also put off all these," is rather ambiguous, and might be given, "But now do ye put off all those."

The phrase, "with much contention," 1 Thess. ii, 2, is apt, from its present use, to mislead; but it refers here to contest with external evils and hostilities; "in much conflict," as in Col. ii, 1, "striving" being the word in the older versions.

1 Thess. ii, 6, reads, "when we might have been burdensome," but should be "when we might have used authority"—stood on our right as apostles, and demanded a sufficient maintenance.

In 2 Tim. iii, 7, the connection is somewhat equivocal; but the words "ever learning" refer to the "silly women," not to those that lead them captive.

¹ "You" in 1611.

"Peculiar," Titus ii, 14, is liable to be misunderstood, for it has its Latin sense of special possession, and not the modern sense of "singular." It came in from Tyndale, Luther having *zum eigenthum*.¹

Hebrews xii, 2, "looking unto Jesus; the author and finisher of our faith;" literally, "of the faith"—the faith that is held forth as having produced the bright bed-roll of the previous chapter.

In Heb. xii, 23, the phrase, "general assembly," is vague, and has, moreover, a technical meaning in Scotland. The term means an assembly holding high festival.

The position of "also" in the clause "wherefore seeing we also are compassed about," Heb. xii, 1, mars the sense, for the apparent meaning is, "that the worthies celebrated in the previous chapter were also surrounded by a great cloud as we are;" whereas the sense is, that they form the cloud of witnesses overlooking the course, and we are "also," as they did, to lay aside every entanglement, and to run the race with that perseverance of which they set us an example.

In James i, 1, 2, though there is no ambiguity, the version might be more exact—"wisheth joy"—"count it all joy."

In Rev. i, 9, the statement, "I was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ," is ambiguous, as "for" may mean either that he was in Patmos, having come to it for the purpose of preaching the Gospel, or that he was in it, having been exiled to it, for having preached the Gospel.

The real meaning of the clause "are and were created," Rev. iv, 11, depends upon the punctuation, and it is usually printed, though not in 1611, as if "are" and "were" both belonged to "created" as auxiliaries, whereas there are two distinct propositions, "they were," and "they were created." The rendering "for thy pleasure" in the same clause is worse than ambiguous—it conveys a wrong reference to the English reader, as if the sense might be, "to yield thee pleasure"; but the true translation is, "on account of thy will," or "because thou didst will it."

¹ See p. 262.

The sense in Rev. xiii, 8, depends also on the pointing—"written in the book of life, of the Lamb slain, from the foundation of the world." Many modern editions have no comma at all, and in the edition of 1611 there is a comma after "Lamb." The Book of Life was written from the foundation of the world.

John vi, 33, should be "the bread of God is that" not "he." The term "heresy" in Acts xxiv, 14, tends to suggest a wrong meaning, as it now denotes false doctrine, or doctrine that deviates from some recognized standard, but the Greek noun so rendered means simply a party, faction, or sect. Philip. ii, 6, "thought it not robbery to be equal with God" does not harmonize with the context, the leading precept being, "look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others," in the spirit and after the example of Christ Jesus, who possessed equality with God, but did not regard it as something to be held tenaciously, for looking upon the things of others he emptied himself of the "form of God," and took upon him the form of a servant, &c. "Form of God" cannot mean the Essence of God; it is the manifestation of that Essence. The second clause of the last petition in the Lord's Prayer, Matt. vi, 13, "but deliver us from evil" is quite indefinite, for it may mean either "from evil" or "from the evil one." The sense can be determined only from the usage of the New Testament, as found in such places as Matt. xiii, 19, 38; John xvii, 15; Eph. vi, 16; 1 John ii, 13, 14; iii, 12; v, 18. In the statement Acts ii, 25, "I foresaw the Lord always before my face," the verb refers to place and not, as it does now, to time, the true rendering being given in the original psalm. The English reader, not pondering the connection very closely, might be perplexed by 1 Thess. i, 4, "knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God," and not be able to say whether this knowledge is possessed by the apostle and his associates or the Thessalonians themselves. Of course the Greek is very plain on the point, "knowing (as we do), brethren beloved of God, your election." In Acts ii, 23, the sense is, "and by hands of lawless men," that is heathen men, "ye." In Philip. iv, 15, "now ye Philippians know also" sounds like an imperative, but it is only a statement. Compare

also Luke ii, 29, "now thou releasest thy servant," "thou lettest thy servant depart."¹ In Acts v, 30, the better rendering is "whom ye hanged on a tree and slew," the participle describing the mode should precede the verb in translation.

At the same time, many peculiarities affecting the sense cannot well find place in any translation, at least in any English version. An impersonal plural is sometimes found translated as singular passive, as in Luke xii, 20, "thy soul shall be required of thee." The idiom, however, is rendered as plural in vi, 38, "men" being inserted as the nominative; but the inference is probably to higher beings. Similarly, and more correctly, in John xv, 6, "men gather them." It is not easy to represent the third personal pronoun when it occupies an emphatic place in the Greek text. The nouns rendered "respect of persons," James ii, 1, "conversation" in 1 Pet. i, 15, "ungodly" in Jude 18, and the adjective rendered "equal" in Philip. ii, 6, are in the plural number, and cannot well be represented in our idiom. Neither can such a connection as that in Rev. iii, 4; Gal. iii, 16, where a neuter substantive is followed by a masculine relative, nor the neuter adjective in the last clause of Matthew xii, 41, 42. How shall we represent that the two nominatives in 1 Thessalonians iii, 11, are connected as singular optative verbs?² On the other hand, sometimes the Greek singular is so vaguely translated that it may be almost taken in our Bible as either singular or plural. 1 Pet. iii, 18, "the just for the unjust," that is, "a just one for unjust ones"; James v, 6, "ye have both condemned and killed the just," the just one, whatever be the reference.³ To preserve the harmony of the image, "book" should be "roll" in Rev. v, 1; "goblets" would be better than "vials" in Rev. xvi, 1.

The true rendering of Gal. iv, 24, is not "which things are an allegory," but "which things are allegorized," the historic facts not being explained away.

¹ See Vol. I, p. 145.

² See also 2 Thess. ii, 16.

³ The phrase about the paralytic "borne of four," Mark ii, 3, has given

rise, in the land of Gaelic and glens, to the whispered mysterious question, if the man had sprung from a four-fold maternity.

The translation of James iii, 3, "Behold, we put bits in the horses' mouths, that they may obey us," is scarcely precise enough; but it is rather (not to take up the various reading), "if we put the bits (or bridle) of horses into their mouths in order that they may obey us, we turn about also their whole body."—As the small bit curbs the horse, and the small rudder turns the ship, as the small sparks set fire to the forest, so the tongue, a tiny organ, controls the man.

James ii, 1, "my brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ the Lord of glory with respect of persons." In this translation the common mind does not readily seize the point. But the verb is imperative: "my brethren, do not ye have or hold the faith . . . along with respecting of persons." The two things are so contradictory that they should not meet in the same person.

The participle rendered "cloven," in Acts ii, 3, means parting asunder or distributing themselves—a different idea altogether.

1 Pet. i, 17, reads, "and if ye call on the Father," which, from the position of the Greek words, is not correct, though found in Tyndale, the Great Bible, the Genevan of 1557 having, "if so be that ye call him Father," and that of 1560, "if ye call him Father," a translation adopted by Dr. Trench, but not quite accurate, as it does not take the preposition into account. Literally, it is, "if ye call on him as Father"—if ye invoke Him in his paternal character.

The punctuation misleads in 1 Peter i, 11, "searching what, or what manner of time"; the clause would thus seem to mean that the prophets searched first into the meaning of the oracle, and then into the time of its fulfilment; but the sense is, "what time or what manner of time."¹

The punctuation always depends ultimately on the exegesis. What is the right division of words in Heb. xii, 22, 23? Which is the last clause of the one verse and first clause of the other? Does "which" refer to "God" or "word," in 1 Pet. i, 23? In 1 Pet. v, 12, does "to you" belong to "faithful" or to "brother"? The spelling of the word "spirit," with a capital or without, presents distinct senses to the English

¹ τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρόν.

reader, and is certainly to him "a note and comment." It has been questioned whether "therefore" should be at the end of John vii, 21, or at the beginning of verse 22. Much depends on the pointing of Luke xxiii, 43. Is John v, 39, to be read as indicative or as imperative; or Luke ix, 55; or John xii, 27, middle clause; or Heb. xii, 5, or xiii, 6.

The technical name "diaspora," should have been rendered the "dispersion:"¹ "will he go unto the dispersion among the Greeks or Gentiles?" John vii, 35; also, James i, 1, and 1 Peter i, 1. John xiii, 2, the true rendering of the participle is not "supper being ended," but "during supper," or "supper having begun," or "having been served."²

James i, 27, "religion" is not emotion based on faith, but religious service, as the verse indeed indicates.

Rev. x, 6, "That there should be time no longer"—the clause is somewhat dark, and is often misunderstood as referring to the last day, or the end of time ushering in eternity. The "time," however, is intervening time or delay, in allusion to the cry of the martyrs in vi, 10, "How long, O Lord?"

What sense can be made of Rev. xvii, 8, "They that dwell on the earth shall wonder when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is"—a creature of which existence and non-existence are predicated in the same breath? better, "when they see the beast that he was, and is not, and shall come, or shall be present (again)."

The plain reader is apt to be startled by the words, "But God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin," Rom. vi, 17, and perhaps some slight supplement might be necessary to throw the force upon the past "were."³

¹ διασπορά.

² δέειπνον γε(οr γι)νομένον.

³ On the meaning of ἐπιούσιος, and a defence of the common rendering in the Lord's Prayer, see Canon Lightfoot's rich and exhaustive paper in his volume On a

Fresh Revision of the English New Testament, Appendix, p. 195; and see also the critical argument in favour of another meaning, "bread of life eternal," in M'Clellan's New Testament, vol. I, p. 632.

CHAPTER LII.

THE translators or revisers of 1611, in their desire to avoid the rigid uniformity of the Rheims version, have allowed themselves considerable latitude in an opposite direction, and they plead for it in their preface: "An other thing we thinke good to admonish thee of (gentle Reader), that we haue not tyed our selues to an vniformitie of phrasing, or to an identitie of words, as some peraduenture would wish that we had done, because they obserue that some learned men some where, haue beene as exact as they could that way.¹ Truly, that we might not varie from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same thing in both places (for there bee some wordes that bee not of the same sense euery where) we were especially carefull, and made a conscience, according to our duetie. But, that we should expresse the same notion in the same particular word; as for example, if we translate the Hebrew or Greeke word once by *Purpose*, neuer to call it *Intent*; if one where *Iourneying*, neuer *Traueiling*; if one where *Thinke*, neuer *Suppose*; if one where *Paine*, neuer *Ache*; if one where *Ioy*, neuer *Gladnesse*, &c. Thus to minse the matter, wee thought to sauour more of curiositie than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorne in the Atheist, than bring profite to the godly Reader. For is the kingdome of God become words or syllables? why should wee be in bondage to them if we may

¹ Perhaps their allusion may be to Hugh Broughton's Letter on Translation which Bancroft sent to them, and it enacts the peremptory canon as its fifth rule, "The same terms must be translated the same way." Uniformity of rendering is also contended for by Erasmus and Beza.

be free, vse one precisely when wee may vse another no lesse fit, as commodiously?"

Had they used this privilege within such limits as they exemplify in the previous extract, no great fault might be found, but they have taken continuous and extraordinary license. For in working under this self-imposed canon, they give various renderings without stint to the same noun, verb, or particle, and by the reverse process they affix, in numberless instances, the same English word to very different Greek terms. In this way they often efface important distinctions which might have been preserved, and create new distinctions which ought not to exist. Not that they are to be blamed for introducing all these various renderings, for many of them existed before, and they found not a few of them in the Bishops' which they revised, and also in the earlier versions.

At the same time, to insist on rigid uniformity of translation would be absurd in principle, and misleading in result, for it must occasionally violate idiom and context. Thus the word "part" may be the usual rendering of a Greek noun, but when applied to a boat, it becomes, according to usage, "side," John xxi, 6. The substantive commonly standing as "partakers" in the majority of places at once becomes "partners" in Luke v, 7, according to English idiom. The term which is rendered "word" scores of times necessarily becomes "account" in such a phrase as Luke xvi, 2, "give an account of thy stewardship." "Meat" well represents a Greek substantive, but the term would be incongruous in reference to the corrosion of metal—eating into it—and so it technically passes into "rust" in Matthew vi, 19, 20, after Tyndale, the "canker" of the Genevan not being accepted either in the Bishops' or the present version. With generic sameness there may be specific difference. What is a living "tree" in Luke xxiii, 31 and in Rev. xxii, 2, is "wood" (timber) in Rev. xviii, 12, "staves" (clubs) in Matt. xxvi, 47, "stocks" in Acts xvi, 24, and "tree" means a "stake" in Acts v, 30. Some supernatural beings are known as angels, but the same Greek term could not be so rendered in James ii, 25, as

designating the spies whom Rahab treated so kindly, and the word is given there as "messengers." Elymas is termed a "sorcerer"¹ Acts xiii, 8, but the same noun could not well bear that translation in Matt. ii, 1, and it stands there as "wise men." The term rendered "Lord" in an address to a higher being, Matt. viii, 25, naturally becomes "sir" in speaking to one supposed to be a human equal, John iv, 11, xx, 15. A word may always retain the radical notion of heat or fervour, but there may be subjective or objective differences springing from the character of him who feels it, or from the persons or things which excite it. "Zeal"² in John ii, 17, and Colossians iv, 13, is "jealousy" in 2 Corinthians xi, 2; "envying" in Romans xiii, 13, "indignation" in Acts v, 17, the Rheims having "replenished with zeal." A verb may admit of several modified senses or renderings, while the same idea is underlying all of them. It may mean to "send away,"³ as a wife by divorce, or to leave persons, places, nets, or to suffer or permit a thing, or to let off or forgive. A word may mean generally to make apparent,⁴ but what is made apparent may be a statement, or a report, or a charge in a court of law, or a man's own self, and the English word would require some difference of rendering in such instances. Prepositions with the primal meaning always involved must also be modified in rendering, as they may refer to place, or time, or have a tropical signification. Still, uniformity ought to be kept wherever it can be kept. If the sacred writer has thought it fit to repeat the same Greek term, why may not the English translator do the same? In this way the characteristic differences in the various books can be preserved, and the ordinary reader will see that each writer has his favourite words, and familiar turns of speech. For the four Evangelists, in telling the same story, have each a distinctive style of thought, structure and language: the Memorabilia of St. Matthew marked by a Hebrew tincture and purpose, and by the grouping of parables and miracles: Mark characterized by minute and graphic touches brought out with

μάγος
³ ἀπολύω

² ζήλος
⁴ φανερώ

rugged force: Luke exhibiting some historic research and writing a purer and more sustained historic style: and John the Divine glorified in his ethereal portraiture of the Word made flesh, with grace poured into His lips, and the fulness of infinite love in His heart. The apostle Paul has frequent participial connections and compound verbs, a tendency to go off at a word and to interweave a parenthesis, and a fondness to exhibit relations by an accumulation of prepositions. And all these features ought to be notable and striking in any translation.

When an author writes his own thoughts, he may employ whatever language is best fitted to convey them with clearness and power, and for the sake of euphony he may exchange terms of Saxon and Latin lineage. Original composition would be bald if the same words were often repeated, and such poverty or want of variety would be an injustice to our rich and noble tongue. Nor in translating a classic would a scholar be bound to give in every case, without deviation, the same English for the same Greek term or phrase.¹ It is not expected of him, though he is supposed to present a literal and faithful version. Men of classic tastes and acquirements are able to consult the original, and of those who are not so qualified, a fraction only will possess or read such a book in the vernacular. But even in such a case there are limits to variation of rendering. What would have been said of Lord Derby's Translation of the Iliad, if for the sake of variety he had inserted occasionally other English forms of such frequent epithets as "cloud-compeller," "blue-eyed," "white-armed," "king of men," "dark-ribbed"? Would not one special characteristic of the father of song have been wilfully effaced?

The following terms, characteristic of a divine revelation of love to a sinful world, are of perpetual occurrence both in the Old and New Testament: "mercy" and its adjective are used nigh 300 times; "righteous" with its derivatives more than

¹ In Ainsworth's learned Annotations on the Pentateuch some examples of translations of the kind referred to may be found. See also Revision of the English Version, by Philip Schaff, D.D., New York, 1875, and Revision of the English Bible (p.191), by John R. Beard, D.D., London, 1857.

500 times; "pray" and "worship" are met with at least 400 times, and "save," "saviour," "salvation" nigh 500 times. These terms illustrate by their pervading presence the nature of the Book to which they belong, and therefore they are not in any way to be disguised or weakened by synonymous changes, for the Book not only reveals deliverance from guilt, but leads to the service of the Divine Benefactor whose mercy is conditioned by righteousness, and to whom on His throne of grace all have access, while every one who comes is welcomed through the merit and mediation of the Living Intercessor. The repetition of such words is of itself refreshing, like "rain upon the mown grass." It is matter of regret that the noun "faith" has no verb of its own root, but that "believe" must be employed—to the loss of the English reader who does not readily feel the connection between the two words. In the Authorized Version these words often meet us, "faith" being found more than 340 times, and "belief" nigh 300 times, the allied word "trust" showing itself also scores of times. Neither is there any Saxon verb cognate to "righteousness," and the Latin "justify" has been used, to the loss of the English student of the New Testament, who fails to perceive the close relation. Might not "righten" have sufficed? for "justification" is the rightening of the guilty soul in the eye of God, and of his law. Such rightening is ever based on righteousness, either that belonging to the creature himself, or, as in our case, that wrought out by the Sinbearer, and accepted by us—"the righteousness which is of God by faith."¹ Such words are distinctive and must be of constant iteration in the Records of a system which holds up faith as the one grand requisite—the one living medium of blessing, since through it, as the receptive faculty, pardon, purity, and life are brought home to the heart which believes the Testimony, and has its personal trust in Him whom that Testimony enshrines.

It is quite true that the sense is not affected by many minor variations, such as the following in the one chapter of Matthew and the corresponding passage of Mark.

¹ See Girdlestone's Synonyms of the Old Testament. London, 1871.

MATTHEW XXIV.

Verse
14 Witness.
17 Come down.
18 Return back.
21 Tribulation.
„ Since the beginning.
23 Believe it not.
24 The very elect.
25 Told you before.
29 Shall the sun be darkened.
32 His branch.
„ Nigh.
34 Be fulfilled.

MARK XIII.

Verse
9 Testimony.
15 Go down.
16 Turn back again.
19 Affliction.
„ From the beginning.
21 Believe him not.
22 Even the elect.
23 Foretold you.
24 The sun shall be darkened.
28 Her branch.
„ Near.
30 Be done.

Additional examples may be adduced from the Synoptical Gospels, and in most of them the meaning is not seriously marred.

Matt. iii, 4, "a leathern girdle"—Mark i, 6, "a girdle of skin." Matt. iii, 8, "meet for repentance"—Luke iii, 8, "worthy of repentance." Matt. iv, 6, "concerning thee"—Luke iv, 10, "over thee." Matt. iv, 19, "follow me"—Mark i, 17, "come ye after me." Matt. iv, 20, "they left their nets"—Mark i, 18, "they forsook their nets." Matt. vi, 10, "in earth as it is in heaven"—Luke xi, 2, "as in heaven, so in earth." Matt. vii, 1, "that ye be not judged"—Luke vi, 37, "and ye shall not be judged." Matt. viii, 8, "shouldest come"—Luke vii, 6, "shouldest enter." Matt. viii, 33, "they that kept"—Mark v, 14, "they that fed." Matt. ix, 2, "(thy sins) be forgiven"—Luke v, 20, "are forgiven."¹ Matt. ix, 17, "runneth out"—Mark ii, 22, "spilled." Matt. ix, 6, "go"—Mark ii, 11, "go thy way." Matt. ix, 10, "sat down with"—Mark ii, 15, "sat also together with." Matt. ix, 16, "that which is put in to fill it up"—Mark ii, 21, "that filled it up." Matt. ix, 20, "hem"—Luke viii, 44, "border." Matt. ix, 34, "prince"—Luke xi, 15, "chief." Matt. ix, 37, "harvest . . . plenteous"—Luke x, 2, "harvest . . . great." Matt. x, 14, "when ye depart"—Luke ix, 5, "when ye go out." Matt. x, 14, "the dust"—Luke ix, 5, "the very dust." Matt. x, 18, "governors"—

¹ See page 259.

Mark xiii, 9, "rulers." Matt. x, 21, "shall deliver up"—Mark xiii, 12, "shall betray." Matt. x, 21, "child"—Mark xiii, 12, "son." Matt. x, 22, "but he that endureth to the end shall be saved"—Mark xiii, 13, "but he that shall endure the same shall be saved." Matt. x, 27, "preach"—Luke xii, 3, "proclaim." Matt. xi, 4, "go and shew"—Luke vii, 22, "go your way and tell." Matt. xi, 6, "receive their sight"—Luke vii, 22, "see." Matt. xi, 5, "the poor have the gospel preached"—Luke vii, 22, "to the poor the gospel is preached." Matt. xi, 7, "to say unto the multitudes"—Luke vii, 24, "to speak unto the people." Matt. xi, 12, (kingdom of heaven) "suffereth violence"—Luke xvi, 16, every man "presseth" into it. Matt. ix, 24, "maid"—Mark v, 41, "damsel." Matt. xxvi, 69, "damsel"—Mark xiv, 69, "maid." Matt. xi, 19, "behold a man gluttonous"—Luke vii, 34, "behold a gluttonous man." Matt. xi, 25, "because"—Luke x, 21, "(I thank thee) that." Matt. xii, 27, "children"—Luke xi, 19, "sons." Matt. xiii, 3, "a sower went forth"—Mark iv, 3, "there went out a sower"—Luke viii, 5, "a sower went out." Matt. xiii, 5, "deepness"—Mark iv, 5, "depth." Matt. xiii, 23, "an hundred fold"—Mark iv, 20, "an hundred." Matt. xiii, 32, "least of"—Mark iv, 31, "less than." Matt. xiii, 32, "the greatest among"—Mark iv, 31, "greater than." Matt. xiii, 21, "tribulation"—Mark iv, 17, "affliction." Matt. xiv, 14, "went forth and"—Mark vi, 34, "when he came out." Matt. xiv, 14, "a great multitude"—Mark vi, 34, "much people." Matt. xiv, 24, "tossed with"—Mark vi, 48, "toiling in." Matt. xiv, 35, "country"—Mark vi, 55, "region." Matt. xiv, 35, "those that were diseased"—Mark vi, 55, "those that were sick." Matt. xv, 26, "to dogs"—Mark vii, 27, "unto the dogs." Matt. xv, 27, "truth, Lord"—Mark vii, 28, "yes, Lord." Matt. xv, 32, "continue"—Mark viii, 2, "have now been." Matt. xv, 32, "in the way"—Mark viii, 3, "by the way." Matt. xv, 33, "to fill"—Mark viii, 4, "satisfy." Matt. xv, 39, "took ship"—Mark viii, 10, "entered into a ship." Matt. xvi, 23, "those that be of men"—Mark viii, 33, "the things that be of men." Matt. xvi, 25, "will lose"—Mark viii, 35, "shall lose"—Luke ix, 24, "will lose." Matt. xvi, 28, "till they see"—Mark ix, 1, "till they have seen." Matt. xvii, 1, "bringeth up"—Mark ix, 2, "leadeth."

Matt. xvii, 5, "which said"—Mark ix, 7, "saying." Matt. xvii, 2, "face"—Luke ix, 29, "countenance." Matt. xvii, 18, "departed out"—Mark ix, 26, "came out." Matt. xvii, 19, "apart"—Mark ix, 28, "privately." Matt. xvii, 22, "betrayed,"—Mark ix, 31, "delivered." Matt. xviii, 2, "little child"—Mark ix, 36, "child." Matt. xix, 1, "beyond"—Mark x, 1, "further side." Matt. xix, 7, "writing"—Mark x, 4, "a bill." Matt. xix, 20, "kept"—Mark x, 20, "observed it." Matt. xx, 22, "are ye able?"—Mark x, 38, "can ye?" Matt. xx, 24, "moved with indignation"—Mark x, 41, "much displeased." Matt. xx, 25, "exercise dominion"—Mark x, 42, "exercise lordship." Matt. xx, 27, "chief"—Mark x, 44, "chiefest." Matt. xx, 30, "way"—Mark x, 46, "high way." Matt. xx, 28, "minister"—Luke xxii, 26, "doth serve." Matt. xx, 31, "rebuked"—Mark x, 48, "charged." Matt. xxi, 1, "sent"—Mark xi, 1, "sendeth forth."

Nor does it matter as to meaning in the following variations, some of them quite unaccountable. One verb is twice rendered "exalted" in Luke xviii, 14, while the verb in contrast is in one clause "abased," and in the other clause "humbleth." The same verb which is rendered "merry" in Luke xv, 24, becomes "make merry" in verses 29 and 32. "Beloved" in Matt. xvii, 5, and in Mark ix, 7, becomes "well-beloved" in Mark xii, 6, "dearly beloved" in Romans xii, 19, and simply "dear" in Eph. v, 1; "without excuse" in Romans i, 20, is "inexcusable" in ii, 1; "willing to show the Jews a pleasure," Acts xxiv, 27, becomes in xxv, 9, "willing to do the Jews a pleasure." The familiar compound noun rendered "adoption," Rom. ix, 4, becomes "adoption of sons" in Gal. iv, 5, and "adoption of children" in Eph. i, 5. How could such variations originate?

There may be no sensible loss as to ultimate sense in the following cluster of changes; a particle rendered in these different ways, yea, rather, nay, but, yes, verily, yea doubtless, or the same preposition rendered for the sake, for the cause, because, wherefore, for, by reason of.¹ The same preposition assumes two different forms in the same verse, 2 Cor. i, 11,

¹ διὰ.

in the first clause "for us," and in the last clause, "on our behalf"; and "what" and "how" in the same verse represent the same interrogative pronoun, 1 Cor. vii, 16. "Carried away to Babylon" in Matt. i, 11, is "brought to Babylon" in the next verse; the "jailor" in Acts xvi, 23, is "keeper of the prison" in 27; "beareth fruit" in John xv, 2, occurs in two consecutive clauses, but "bring forth fruit" in the third clause. The same document called a "letter" in Acts xxiii, 25, is "epistle" in 33, the same change occurring in a single verse in 2 Cor. vii, 8. "Truth" in the first part of the verse in 1 Tim. ii, 7, is "verity" in the second; "dwell" in the first clause of John i, 39, is "abide" in the following one, "apparel" in James ii, 2, is "raiment" in 3; "profession" in 1 Tim. vi, 12, is "confession" in 13; the epithet "living" in 1 Peter ii, 4, is "lively" in 5, vailing the identity of Christ's life with that of his people; "were afraid" in Luke xxiv, 5, is "affrighted" in 37. The same technical noun rendered "dispersed" in John vii, 35, becomes "which are scattered abroad" in James i, 1, and simply "scattered" in 1 Peter i, 1. In the same verse (Matt. xxvii, 60), "tomb" occurs, and then "sepulchre,"¹ representing the same noun. In Luke xvi, 8, 9, 10, we have the epithet "unjust" and then "unrighteous," for the same Greek term. "To company" in 1 Cor. v, 9, becomes "to keep company" in 11. But though in these examples the meaning is not obscured, the English reader loses something, for he fails to identify the terms employed by the sacred writer. Why should not he have the same advantages as the reader of the Greek original? Is he not entitled to demand it?

Capricious love of variety is often manifest, for one term is represented by "field," "farm," "country," "land," "piece of ground,"² while "field" might suit many of the places. "Salute" and "greet" are renderings often exchanged to no desirable purpose—"salute" being the only rendering in the Gospels; "embraced" and "took leave" get a place in Acts, while "greet" occurs four times in Romans xvi, as against "salute" seventeen times. "Salute" and "greet" both occur

¹ μνημεῖον.² ἀγρός.

twice in 1 Cor., and once in 2 Cor.; "salute" and "greet" are found in the same verse in Phil. iv, 21, also in Titus iii, 15, and in 3 John 14; "embraced" is a wrong rendering in Heb. xi, 13; "greet" is used in all cases where the addition is made of "an holy kiss" or a "kiss of charity," except in Romans xvi, 16. Why should the noun rendered "goodness" in Romans be "gentleness" in Galatians, but "kindness" in the other parts of the New Testament? Why should the same word be "debtor" in Matt. xxiii, 16, but "guilty" in 18? Why should "wailing" be found twice in one chapter of Matthew (xiii), and "weeping" be the rendering of the same term in every other place? "Faithful"¹ in the first three Gospels is also found in 2 Tim., and on to the end of the New Testament, but it is "believing" in John xx, 27, and several times in 1 Tim. (in which it is also translated "true"), but is rendered in other places by some part of the verb "believe." On the other hand, while the noun which is always correctly rendered "unbelief" has its adjective as "faithless" in the Gospels, with one exception, but in the Epistles "unbelievers," "unbelieving," "believeth not," it is also twice rendered by "infidel" as in 2 Cor. vi, 15, and in 1 Tim. v, 8. What possible end could be gained by giving the same phrase nine times as "eternal life," or "life eternal," and eight times "everlasting life" or "life everlasting," the odd thing being that it is uniformly "eternal" in Mark and in the first Epistle of John, while the renderings regularly alternate in Luke, Acts, and 1 Timothy, and it cannot but perplex when "everlasting punishment" occurs in one clause, and "life eternal" in the next in Matt. xxv, 46. The same adverb² is "of a truth," "surely," "truly," in Matthew; "of a truth" always in Luke; but "indeed" in John six times, and in 1 John "verily." Why should one simple verb³ have three translations in Matthew, "abide," "remain," "tarry," while in the one verse in Luke xxiv, 29, the expressed desire is "abide with us," and the result is thus stated, "and he went in to tarry"? In John we find "abode," "remain," "dwell," "continue," "tarry," and "endure," and this diversity is continued throughout the New Testament,

¹ πιστός.² ἀληθῶς.³ μένω.

only that "dwell" is the uniform rendering in the fourth chapter of 1 John, but in the second chapter of the same Epistle, verse 24, the verb is given in the same verse as "abide," "remain," "continue." Surely this favourite term of John which occurs about as often in his writings as in all the other parts of the New Testament should receive as far as possible a uniform rendering. Confusion is created by rendering the same verb¹ rightly, by "hope" thirteen times, and wrongly by "trust" in eighteen other places. The substantive² which is always "trespasses" in the Gospels, is "offence" in the polemical section of Romans, but "fall" in Romans xi, 11, 12, "fault" in Galatians vi, 1, and in James v, 16. "Trespasses" might suit the most of these places, and there was surely no reason why the noun should be in Col. ii, 13, "sins" in the first clause, and "trespasses" in the last. The word translated "helper"³ (Rom. xvi, 3) is also rendered with no apparent necessity—"work-fellow," "fellow-worker," "fellow-helper," "fellow-labourer," "labourer together with." These variations might be greatly abridged, and "fellow-worker" might take their place. It is worse than mere variation to render a verb in one verse "did service," and then in the following verse to alter it into "be in bondage" in Gal. iv, 8, 9. It is bewildering to find without any tangible reason the same phrase given as "God, even the Father,"⁴ in Romans xv, 6, 1 Cor. xv, 24, and 2 Cor. i, 3; "God and the Father" in Col. iii, 17; "the God and Father" in 2 Cor. xi, 31, Eph. i, 3, and 1 Peter i, 3; "of God and of the Father," Col. ii, 2; but the common Greek text in the latter part of this last verse cannot be sustained. Similar variations are found in the older versions. One can assign no ground why the quotation from Deut. xxxii, 35, should be presented as "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord," in Rom. xii, 19, but "vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord," in Heb. x, 30, the variation originating with Tyndale. "Rabbi," the official Syro-Chaldaic term in English characters, is rightly found in seven places, but it is gratuitously turned into "Master," in some eight other places, as "Hail, master," in

¹ ἐλπίζω.² συνεργός.³ παράπτωμα.⁴ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ.

Matt. xxvi, 49, where "Rabbi" should have been kept to show that the traitor gave the Lord his full formal title in the very act of over-kissing and selling him. "Rabboni," which is found only twice, is given as "Lord" in Mark x, 51, but "Rabboni" in John xx, 16. The verb which means literally "to speak against,"¹ when the participle becomes a kind of epithet, gets the translation of "gainsaying," and "gainsayer," the first syllable "gain" being really against, both the Wycliffite versions having the full form, "againsaying," in Jude 11; but there was no charm in giving the Saxon form "spake against" in the first part of the verse, and the literal Latin form "contradicting" in the second in Acts xiii, 45, while it becomes "not answering again" in Titus ii, 9, a counsel addressed to slaves, the margin having rightly "not gainsaying," which is the text of the Rheims; "again" was introduced by Tyndale, and kept by the older versions, as if to answer again implied opposition or refusal. "Put on"² would suit all the places literal and metaphorical where we have "had on," "clothed with," "arrayed," but in Mark xv, 17, 20, we have "clothed him" in one verse, and "put clothes on" in the other. What edification was there in altering "sick of the palsy" into "taken with palsy," and in alternating these renderings of the participle so precisely in Luke and Acts, and allowing it to degenerate into "feeble" in Heb. xii, 12. The same participle is rendered in the same breath, "that preach the gospel," and "bring glad tidings of good things," Rom. x, 15, the Rheims version being at the other and awkward extreme, "that evangelise peace," "that evangelise good things." The epithet "fair" applied to the babe Moses in Acts vii, 20, is "proper" in Heb. xi, 23. These changes often happen within the limits of the same book, the same chapter—aye, as we have seen more than once, the same verse. We can discern little motive for them in many places, but the desire to enliven the version by the use of terms all but synonymous. Thus "all manner of sickness" in Matt. iv, 23, becomes "every sickness" in ix, 35; "affliction" in Mark iv, 17, is "tribulation" in xiii, 24; "deceit" in Mark vii, 22, is "craft" in xiv, 1; "armour" in

¹ ἀντιλέγω.² ἐνδύω.

2 Cor. vi, 7, is "weapons" in x, 4; "honesty" in 1 Tim. ii, 2, is "gravity" in iii, 4.

Many of the examples in the previous paragraphs show variation apparently for the wanton love of it, and might be greatly reduced in number, though absolute uniformity might not be everywhere obtainable, or even desirable. The common reader has no means whatever of detecting these changes, and probably marks them in his mind as proofs of different readings in the original.

But though the meaning, as has been mentioned already, may not be altered by some of these unneeded changes, yet often they obscure the connection. In Colossians ii, 9, we have "in him dwelleth all the fulness," and then in 11, "ye are complete in him";¹ but the terms employed are cognate, "ye are filled up in him"—the fulness of Christ and the fulness of Christ's. The connection is clouded by the variation, and the older versions are followed; only in this epistle is the verb so rendered. "Hurt and damage" in Acts xxvii, 10, becomes "harm and loss" in verse 21. The sense is not injured, but the change veils the connection between the prediction of the apostle and its precise fulfilment. No difference of sense is involved in the various renderings of "kin," "kinsfolk," "kinsman," but there is an unwarranted speciality to modern readers in the translation "cousin," in Luke i, 36 and 58. "Cousin" represented in those days various relationships, but Tyndale needed not to have varied from his own "kyns-woman," in Lev. xviii, 12. The technical term "hinder part of the ship" in Mark iv, 38, is rendered "stern" in Acts xxvii, 29, and "hinder part" in verse 41, in contrast with "the fore part," in the same verse. The clause "it was counted unto him for righteousness" in Romans iv, 3, is rendered "imputed to him" in verse 22; and in the same chapter the verb is "reckoned" three times, and "imputed" six times. The pregnant phrase occurs also in Gal. iii, 6, and in James ii, 23. The apostle's studied repetition of such an assertion of grave theological moment should have secured uniformity of rendering. In the matter of Easteru clothing, though

¹ πληρωμα . . . πεπληρωμένοι.

the drapery is so very simple, the translators have run riot. One term¹ is represented by "long garment," "long clothing," "long robes,"—"robes," the best rendering, the only one used in the Apocalypse, being quite sufficient. Another term² is rendered "cloke," both as a general term, and a special one for the outer robe; but there are also "robe," "vesture," "apparel," "raiment" ten times, about ten times "garment," and often "clothes." A third term,³ meaning the inner robe, or tunic, is given most frequently as "coat," once "garment," in Jude 23, and once "clothes," in Mark xiv, 63. A fourth term⁴ is translated by "apparel," "clothing," "raiment," "robe," while another noun,⁵ allied to the second referred to, is "raiment," "vesture," "apparel," and "array" in 1 Tim. ii, 9, as if it had been suggested by "gold or pearls." Though "satisfy," Mark viii, 4, occurs in the introduction to the miracle, and in the record of it in verse 8 is changed into "filled," the meaning is not lost, but the correspondence of the result to the challenge offered by the disciples is darkened. What possible connection could the common reader imagine between the phrases, "dost thou commit sacrilege?" in Romans ii, 22, and the metamorphosed rendering, "robbers of churches," in Acts xiv, 37? "Sacrilege" came in with the Genevan of 1560, and was adopted by the Bishops' and the Rheims in both places, Tyndale and the Great Bible having "robbest God of his honour" in the first quotation. "Church" was applied to heathen temples before 1611. The noun which properly signifies "teacher,"⁶ and is so rendered ten times, becomes "master" in no less than forty-six passages in the Gospels and once in the Epistle of James. In this last place the precept, "be not many masters," is specially liable to be misunderstood, if it be not borne in mind that in older English, as in present Scotch, the teacher of a school is familiarly called its "master," as also in the public schools of England. The epithet "Master" so often given to Jesus tends now to mislead, as if it referred to authority, and not to instruction. In Matt. x, 24, the true contrast is, "a disciple (learner) is not above his teacher,"

¹ στολή.² ἱμάτιον.³ χιτῶν.⁴ ἐσθής.⁵ ἱματισμός.⁶ διδάσκαλος.

"and ye call me teacher and Lord"—one who imparts instruction—to whom loyal obedience is due. Another term¹ five times referring to God or the divine Saviour, is rendered "Lord," and five times, referring to man, it is translated "master"—in Timothy, Titus, and 1 Peter; but "master" also stands for wholly different nouns. In John viii, 22, and in Acts vii, 42, the negative particle in an interrogation is from difference of idiom not translated,—“Will he kill himself?” “Have ye offered me slain beasts and sacrifices?” but it is rendered in John iv, 29, “Is not this the Christ?” The variation is unnecessary and confusing; but the last rendering as found in our present Bible, “Is not this the Son of David?” Matt. xii, 23, is an unauthorized deviation from the first edition of 1611, which reads, “Is this the Sonne of David?” The negative particle is also found in a Cambridge quarto of 1637, and in Buck & Daniel’s edition of 1638, though it is not in Barker’s folio of 1640. The better form might be, “Can this be the Christ?”

But it would be wrong to insist that all these swarms of variations were simply the result of a capricious taste, for there is little doubt that the revisers of 1611 imagined that many of the changes which they preserved or introduced were dictated or suggested by the idiom or the context. While they gave “nigh,” “near,” “nigh at hand,” as the renderings of one particle² in reference both to time and place, the meaning slips out of view when it is translated, after the Bishops’ and the Great Bible, simply “from” in Acts i, 12; but probably their reason was, that nearness was implied in the measurement—“a sabbath day’s journey,” Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Genevan having “nye to.” In giving a preposition two renderings in the same clause or question, “the baptism of John, whence was it; from heaven, or of men?” in Matt. xxi, 25, they doubtless imagined that in keeping this variation, which is as old as Tyndale, they were marking the distinction between a divine origin, and a human commission. But as the Evangelist himself did not mark the distinction, why should they attempt it? The noun translated by “famine” and

¹ δεσπότης.² ἐγγύς.

twice by "dearth" in Acts, has in the parable of the prodigal son the rendering "hunger," suggested by its immediate personal application in Luke xv, 17; the older versions and the Rheims have "famine." The word which is given as "creation" five times becomes "creature," where it is regarded as meaning sentient beings, as in Rom. viii, 10, 2 Cor. v, 17, and one can easily imagine the reason why it is rendered "building" in Heb. ix, 11, and "ordinance" in 1 Pet. ii, 13. The personal noun usually rendered "witness"¹ became, in some clauses, naturally "martyr," "the blood of thy martyr" in Acts xxii, 20, "Antipas, my faithful martyr" Rev. ii, 13, "blood of the martyrs" xvii, 6,—the word was left untranslated, as the fires of Smithfield had naturalized it. But it is not in the text of Tyndale, Rogers, or Cranmer, three martyred biblical witnesses, and it came into the Bishops' from the Genevan of 1560, that of 1557 placing it in the margin. The verb commonly represented by "deliver up"¹ becomes "betrayed" when it points to the treachery of Judas, but the revisers were not consistent in observing this distinction; Judas could scarcely designate his own act as treachery, and so it is said, "what will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you?" yet in the next verse the words are "sought opportunity to betray him."² The historian's description of the act should be in the words of him who accepted the bribe to do it. And yet, why should it be "deliver up" in Matt. xxiv, 9, and "betray" in the following verse, when the scenes of persecution are referred to.

We can divine a reason why "change" in Heb. vii, 12, becomes "translation" in xi, 5, and why "elements" in Gal. iv, 3, becomes "rudiments" in Col. ii, 8, and "first principles" in Heb. v, 12. It may be easily understood why the same adjective was "dumb" in such a clause as "the deaf hear" and "the dumb man spake," in Mark vii, 37, and "speechless" in reference to Zechariah, in Luke i, 22. He was, however, deaf as well as dumb, for they made signs to him to know how he would have his son named. The Greek word which when written in English letters is

¹ μάρτυς² παραδίδωμι

"myriads" is, in Jude 14 and Rev. v, 11, "ten thousand"; as a numeral of indefinite vastness, it may be safely applied to angels, "an innumerable company of angels" in Heb. xii, 22; but, with reference to believers in Jerusalem, it dwindles down to "thousands" in Acts xxi, 20, though in an allusion to a great crowd it is "an innumerable multitude" in Luke xii, 1. It may be admitted that "happy" is used in Acts xxvi, 2, as fitting the apostle's condition, but it is also applied to those who suffer persecution in 1 Peter iii, 14, though they had been called "blessed" in Matt. v, 10.

"Parable" is but the Anglicized form of the original Greek term, and it occurs forty-six times: seventeen times in Matthew, thirteen times in Mark, and eighteen times in Luke. It becomes "comparison" in Mark iv, 30, the rendering no doubt suggested by the brevity of the parabolic statement, and "proverb" in Luke iv, 23, the rendering dictated by the pithy nature of the utterance quoted. For a similar reason presented by the context it is translated "figure" in Hebrews ix, 9, and xi, 19. But another word elsewhere rendered "proverb" is rendered "parable" in John x, 6, though in the fourth Gospel the noun truly and properly represented by "parable" never occurs. But the mistranslation in John keeps away from the reader the perception of this difference. Some reason, supposed to lie in the surrounding clauses, probably created the three-fold rendering "in due time," 1 Tim. ii, 6, "in his times," 1 Tim. vi, 15, "in due times," 1 Tit. i, 3;¹ the two first variations are in the Bishops'. Why should the same word be rendered twenty-eight times "charity,"² always but twice in 1 Corinthians, and over eighty times "love," as always in the Gospels and to the end of Romans with one exception, xiv, 15. It is "love" as applied to individual emotion both divine and human;—"love of God," "love of Christ," "God of love," "love to all the saints," but "charity" in reference to the Christian grace in an abstract form; 1 Thess. iii, 6, and 2 Thess. i, 3, being apparent exceptions. As in more recent times, "charity" has passed from its original meaning, and is used to denote either liberality of sentiment or beneficence, the clauses "charity shall cover

¹ καιροῖς ἰδίους.² ἀγάπη.

the multitude of sins," 1 Peter iv, 8, and "shall hide a multitude of sins," James v, 20, are liable to be misunderstood, as if almsgiving could in some sense secure divine forgiveness. In the first instance charity is the veil which love casts over human offences, and in the second the "sins" are those of persons who, being converted, pass into a state of pardon and acceptance. The term "charitably," in the adverbial form, was suddenly introduced by Tyndale in Romans xiv, 15, and was imitated by his successors, though his preference of "love" to "charity" was one of Sir Thomas More's complaints against his translation of 1526.¹ In the special chapter 1 Cor. xiii, "charity" was introduced by the Bishops' Version, all the older New Testaments having "love." Faith, hope, and love stand out in living connexion—faith, child-like; hope, saint-like; but love, God-like; "he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God and God in him."

The verb which means "to put" or "cause to be put to death"² became, when used ethically, "mortify,"³ and a wrong translation occurs in Rom. vii, 4, "ye are become dead to the law," but as the infliction of death does not pass out of the verb, the proper rendering is, "ye were slain, or made dead to the law." It was contrary to the spirit of faithful rendering to give the vague term "comfortless" in John xiv, 18, for the same word is pointedly rendered "fatherless" in James i, 27, but the last rendering was necessitated by the following "widows." The changing of the "thief" of the first three gospels into "robber" in John x, 1, 8, could not be avoided, the clause being "a thief and a robber." Another and distinct term being rendered "thief," they were obliged to introduce "robber," and they have rightly kept it in John xviii, 40, and in 2 Cor. xi, 26.⁴ The adjective usually rendered "com-

¹ See Vol. I, p. 189.

² νεκρῶω

³ "Mortify" is also a Scottish law term, and "mortification" is much the same as the English "mortmain." The property set apart by a deceased donor for charitable uses, is com-

monly called *his* mortification; and his nearest heir, disappointed of his expectations, may, and does sometimes, with caustic Scottish humour, style it "*my* mortification."

⁴ κλέπτης—ληστής.

mon"¹ in the ordinary sense, has the same rendering in Acts x, 14, in reference to the Hebrew ritual, but the translators pass into exegesis when they give "defiled" in Mark vii, 2, "unclean" thrice in Romans xiv, "unholy" in Hebrews x, 29, and the participle by "that defileth" in Rev. xxi, 27, according to the reading of their Greek text. The third person in the Blessed Trinity is sometimes in the New Testament termed "Holy Ghost," and sometimes "Holy Spirit,"² the former being the predominant form and occurring about 90 times. But a careful distinction is observed, as "Ghost" is never used by itself with the article or with a possessive pronoun before it, or a genitive of person or quality after it. It is invariably "the spirit," or "my spirit," or "Spirit of God," or "of the Lord," or "of Christ," or "of wisdom." But while this venerable archaic form, coming down from the Anglo-Saxon gospels and from Wycliffe, may be retained, it must be somewhat stumbling to common readers to find such collocations as "the Holy Ghost was upon him" Luke ii, 26, "it was revealed to him by the Holy Ghost" verse 27, but "he came by the Spirit into the temple," "Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost was led by the Spirit into the wilderness" iv, 1, "he returned in the power of the Spirit" verse 14; "upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost" John i, 33; "filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak . . . as the Spirit gave them utterance" Acts ii, 4; "this spake he of the Spirit, for the Holy Ghost was not yet given" John vii, 39; "which the Holy Ghost teacheth" 1 Cor. ii, 13; "the things of the Spirit of God" verse 14; "by the Spirit of God"—"by the Holy Ghost," both in 1 Cor. xii, 3.

The rendering in the second chapter of Matthew "young child" as applied to Jesus, suggested by the phrase "Mary," or "his mother," becomes simply "child" in the first and second chapters of Luke, and becomes "little child," "little children," in the three Synoptical Gospels, when character or temperament is illustrated.

The noun meaning multitude,³ occurring fifty times in Matthew, is rendered "the people" eight times and "mul-

¹ κοινός.

² τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα.

³ ὄχλος.

titude" forty-two times; in Mark, where it is found thirty-eight times, "people" is the translation twenty times, "multitude" fifteen times, and "press," a new rendering, is given three times. St. Luke uses the term forty-one times, and in twenty-one places it is "people," twice it is "press," and five times it is represented by another new rendering—"company." It has a place in John twenty times, "people" stands for it seventeen times, "multitude" twice, and "company" once. Thus the rendering "multitude," so common in Matthew, falls off in Mark and Luke, and all but disappears in John. It occurs in the other parts of the New Testament twenty-six times, and is rendered eight times "multitude," sixteen times "people," once "company," and once simply "number" in Acts i, 15. Among these renderings, "company" is feeble, and "press" is inferential, taken from the context. But another sense, that of the people as in contrast to the higher ranks, has not been accepted. "Implacable" in Romans i, 31, and not found in the Bishops', becomes something very different,—*"trucebreakers"* in 2 Timothy iii, 3; the common reader can see no connection between these renderings; the term in Romans, however, has no authority.

Each book has in itself similar variations. Thus, in Matthew, the word rendered "cast into prison" in chapter v, 25, becomes "deliver up" in x, 21, and "betray" in xxvi, 21, the right rendering being indicated in the margin. The substantive translated "hem" in ix, 20, and xiv, 36, is altered into "border" in xxiii, 5. The noun rendered "householder" four times—xiii, 27, 52; xx, 1; xxi, 33—is "goodman of the house" in xx, 11, and xxiv, 43; and there are similar variations in the other gospels. In xx, 20, there was no need for following the old versions, and altering the translation of the same word in the same clause, the right rendering being, "Then came the mother of Zebedee's sons with her sons." The Rheims preserves the uniformity. The phrase "he is a debtor" occurs in chapter xxiii, 16, but the same Greek words are rendered "he is guilty" in verse 18, with "debtor or bound" in the margin, showing that the variation was no inadvertence. Tyndale has "offendeth" in both verses, and he is followed by

the Genevan, which has "debtor" in the margin. Coverdale and the Great Bible read "is guilty" in both places, the Bishops' having "he is a debtor," and the Rheims "he is bound." What but an excessive desire of rhetorical variation could have induced the rendering of the same verb in the same verse by "separate" in the one clause, and "divide" in the following one, Matt. xxv, 32; or in xviii, 33, "compassion" in the one clause, and "pity" in the next; or in xii, 5, "blameless," but "guiltless" in verse 7. The word rendered "streets" in Mark vi, 56, is "market" in vii, 4, and, more correctly, "market-place," in xii, 38.

A special characteristic of the style of St. Mark is obliterated by adopting different translations, for the adverb¹ which occurs nine times in the first chapter, and is rendered "straightway" four times, "forthwith" twice, "immediately" twice, and "anon" once. At least uniform rendering should have been preserved; for though the sense is not altered, a peculiarity of the evangelist's rough and graphic diction is lost to the English reader. The same adverb occurs often through the gospel, "immediately" and "straightway" being the commonest renderings; but we have also for it "as soon as," in v, 36, and xi, 2, while we have "by and bye" in Luke xvii, 7, and xxi, 9—a phrase which has changed its meaning. Many other features of the style of this evangelist cannot be easily reproduced in any version; such as his accumulation of negatives, and his use of diminutives. But other peculiarities, springing out of his vivid and sudden dashes, ought not to be toned down in any translation. If such clauses appear bold and jagged in English, they are equally rough in Greek. The same noun is "*broken meat*" in chapter viii, 8, but "*fragments*" in verses 19, 20.

The differences in rendering the same simple Greek term are quite amazing. The following examples show that every wrong method has been taken. When it is recorded, in chapter x, 13, that "they brought young children to him," it only confuses the reader to find in the Lord's invitation, "suffer the little children to come," as if two different terms

¹ εὐθὺς, εὐθέως.

had been employed, and two juvenile classes were in some way referred to. Our version in this variation follows the Rheims, which deviates here from its usual accuracy, while the Genevan and the Great Bible reverse the change, Tyndale having simply "children," the Bishops' "young children," in both verses; Coverdale having first "children," and then "the children."

In Luke the "inn" in chapter ii, 7, is the "guestchamber" in xxii, 11. Very strangely, the benediction is "blessed *be ye*" in vi, 20, and "blessed *are ye*" in the others; the words in italics in our common Bibles are not in italics in the first edition of 1611. A striking phrase is given thus—"thy faith hath saved thee"¹ in vii, 50, and xviii, 42; but the words are altered into "thy faith hath made thee whole" in viii, 48, and xvii, 19, limiting the result to the mere physical restoration, while the verb may imply that the outer healing was a sacramental symbol of inner change and blessing. "Uppermost seats"² in xi, 43, is "highest seats" in xx, 46, and first "chief room" and then "highest room" in xiv, 7, 8. In xix, 13, the lord says to his servants, "occupy till I come," and then he is described in verse 15 as summoning these servants that he might know how much every man had gained by "trading." The word "occupy" once meant to trade, and "occupation" is still used in a similar sense, as in Acts xviii, 3; but "trade," "trading" should have been given in both places, to make the sense intelligible to plain readers.³ The Bishops' and the Rheims preserve the uniformity "occupy"—"occupying." The second Wycliffite version has "chaffare ye"—"how much ech had wonne by chaffaring." The earlier versions exhibit variety.

In St. John the same term which is rendered "governor of the feast" in chap. ii, 8, is turned into "ruler of the feast" in the very next verse. The variation is in Tyndale, but Coverdale has, in both clauses, "master of the feast," and the Rheims, "chief steward." Nicodemus says, "we know that thou art a teacher come from God," in iii, 2, and Jesus, using the same term, replies to him in verse 10, "art thou

¹ ὁσέωκέ σε.² πρωτοκαθεδρία.³ See page 251.

a master in Israel?"—the correspondence of the two statements being so far lost by the change of rendering. The same verb is first "tarry" in the request of the Samaritans in iv, 40, and then "abode" in the clause which relates that the request had been granted. The "small fishes" in vi, 9, become simply "fishes" in 11. In vi, 27, 28, the verb which is translated in the one verse "labour for" is in the next verse given as "work," and the connection of Christ's charge, with the question prompted by it, is weakened by the want of uniformity. The Rheims, after Wycliffe, gives "work for" in the first instance, and thus keeps the connection. In xvi, one verb¹ has three translations, "have I spoken" in verse 1; "have I told you" in 4; and "have said" in 6. In the same chapter, verse 30, the verb is translated first, "we are sure," and then in the same breath, "thou knowest," instead of "now we know that thou knowest,"² and there need have been no antipathy to the characteristic repetition. The verb is first rendered "put" in one clause, and then "thrust" in the next, in xx, 25, as if the impression had been that "thrust," the true meaning, was not applicable to so small an opening as that made by a nail. The variation began with Tyndale; the Genevan and the Rheims preserve at least uniformity, "put my finger,"—"put my hand."

In the account of the institution of the "seven almoners" in Acts vi, "ministration" occurs in verse 1, "serve" in verse 2, and "ministry" in verse 4, for the same term, verb and noun, when one rendering might have sufficed.³ We have, when the term means to wait at table, such variations as "she ministered unto them," Mark i, 31, "hath left me to serve alone," "cumbered with much serving," Luke x, 40. "Serve" again is used in Luke xii, 37, xxii, 26, and throughout the Gospel of John. The noun becomes "relief" in Acts xi, 29, and is correct in sense, though it is an interpretation.

In Acts xvii, delicate points in the apostle's address are lost by gratuitous change of English words. Some of the Athenians called him a "setter forth of strange gods," and in

¹ λελάληκα.² οἶδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας.³ διακονία, διακονεῖν.

his reply he takes up the same term, and says, "Him set I forth unto you," but our version, by giving "declare I unto you," quite obscures the connection. The play upon two words (18) is thus lost by a deflected rendering, the one being given as a "setter forth," and the other "because he preached." The translators might have tried to preserve the likeness of the same verb compounded with two different prepositions, the one presenting the Athenian point of view, and the other that of the historian. Again, he says, "I found an altar with this inscription, To the Unknown God," and adopting the strange epithet "unknown," he proceeds, "Him," or "what unknowing ye worship, set I forth unto you." The reader misses the link through the translation of the participle by the adverb "ignorantly." The variation was found in the older translators, the Rheims again excepted. The verb rendered so vividly, "turned the world upside down," in xvii, 6, sinks into "madest an uproar" in xxi, 38. In the same chapter, the famous spot is called first "Areopagus" in verse 19, and "Mars hill" in verse 21, but an explanation is given in the margin. In xxvi, 24, 25, the directness of the apostle's reply is unfelt, because of a tasteless variation. "Paul, thou art beside thyself," should have been followed by, "I am not beside myself, most noble Festus," or, "Paul, thou art mad," "I am not mad"—the apostle takes up the taunt, and repeats it in his retort. The variation is found in the earlier versions, the Rheims again is to be praised as an exception. The epithet rendered "most excellent" in Luke i, 3, and in Acts xxiii, 26, becomes "most noble" in xxiv, 3, as also in xxvi, 25. In xxviii, 15, a proper name is untranslated, "Appii Forum," but in the next clause another proper name is given as "the Three Taverns."

In Romans ii, 2, 3, "commit" and "do" represent the same verb, the variation being found in Tyndale. In v, 2, 3, 11, occur in succession, the words "rejoice," "glory," "joy," all standing for the same term,¹ the second rendering alone being the correct one, and by the change the exultant style is veiled from the English Protestant reader, the Rheims keeping the uniform translation. Uniformity of rendering is essential to the

¹ *καυχώμεθα.*

full appreciation of an argument; vii, 7, "I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet," it being the same Greek term in both clauses, and there being a special point in the repetition. The older versions keep "lust" in both clauses, Tyndale, followed by the Great Bible, giving, in the first clause, "I had not knowne what lust had meant," and Coverdale, "I had knowne nothinge of lust." The Bishops' follows the Genevan,— "for I had not knowen lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not lust." The variation was brought in by the Rheims through its love of the Latin term concupiscence, which had no correspondent verb in English,— "for concupiscence I knew not, unless the law did say, Thou shalt not covet." The Authorized Version so far followed the Rheims, and places concupiscence in the margin. The noun might be rendered "coveting,"¹ as "lust" has now a restricted signification. In a quotation in x, 19, the same noun is given as "people" in the one clause and "nation" in the other. In xi, 22, the same preposition with the very same reference is rendered in the one clause "on"—"on them"—and in the other "toward"—"toward thee." The connection between the quotation and the prayer in xv, 12, 13, is wholly obscured by translating the verb "trust" in the first instance and its noun "hope" in the second.² It should have been "in Him shall the Gentiles hope,"—"Now the God of hope." What good purpose could be served by rendering the same noun "comfort" in xv, 4, and "consolation" in verse 5. Tyndale introduced the variation; and the Rheims reverses the order, giving "consolation" in the first clause and "comfort" in the second. In 1 Cor. iii, 17, the reader misses entirely the retaliatory nature of the doom predicted, on account of the capricious change in the translation of the same verb—"If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy."³ We cannot understand why such a change should have been made in words so solemn and pointed. As the man does to the temple, so God does to him, the sin not only entailing the penalty, but moulding its form. The Genevan has "destroy" in both clauses, but our version follows the Bishops', which copies the

¹ *ἐπιθυμία.*

² *ἐλπιοῦσιν, ἐλπίδος.*

³ *φθείρει, φθερεῖ.*

earlier translators. Whatever rendering is adopted in the first ought to be repeated in the second clause. Even the Rheims fails here, "But if any man violate the temple of God, God will destroy him." In x, 16, the theme is the utter incongruity between fellowship in the eucharist and in the heathen feasts, but the noun rendered in that verse "communion" of the blood of Christ—"communion" of the body of Christ, becomes in verse 18, in its personal form, "partakers" of the altar, and then, in verse 20, "have fellowship with"; while another word is rightly rendered "partakers" in verses 17, 21.¹ In xi, 29, the noun is wrongly rendered "damnation,"² and then as wrongly "condemnation" in verse 34, "judgment," the right translation, in both cases, being given in the margin. The last word of the clause "then shall I know, even as also I am known," xiii, 12, is rendered more correctly in 2 Cor. vi, 9, as "unknown" and "yet well known." We have in xv, 24-28, the wondrous revelation of the final issue and change of the mediatorial kingdom, with a glimpse of what may be called Christian pantheism as the ultimate result that "God may be all in all." But in these verses, where uniformity of rendering is so essential to a correct understanding of the course of thought, the verb rendered "put down"³ in verse 24 is translated "destroyed" in verse 26, the same action being described in both verses, while in verses 27, 28, another verb⁴ is used no less than six times, but the English reader is kept in ignorance of the emphatic repetition, for it is rendered "put under" three times in verse 27, but in verse 28 it becomes "be subdued," "be subject,"—"put under." If the apostle selected the term and deemed it necessary to repeat it as fitting in to his thought, and did not introduce any variation, why should any version court variety? Repetition of the word cannot be worse in English than it is in Greek written by an inspired apostle who did not spend time in verbal elaboration or polish. Though there was no risk of misunderstanding the matter, yet there was no gain in rendering the same noun by "collection" in xvi, 1, and by "gathering" in the following

¹ κοινωνοί, μετέχω.² κρίμα.³ καταργέω.⁴ ὑποτάσσω.

verse, the reverse of Coverdale's order, the Rheims having the Latin term in both clauses. Our version simply followed the Bishops', the older version giving "gathering"—"gatherings."

The apostle sometimes carries through a long paragraph some leading term which gives life and colouring to it. The word appears and reappears, like a golden thread in a woven tissue. It is used and used again in his glowing rapidity of utterance, taken up again and again at every fresh turn. So long as the train of thought is unexhausted, this characteristic word is kept hold of, as if the repetition gave strength to the argument which no mere pronominal reference could supply. Thus it is in the thirteenth chapter of the first Epistle in a marked form; the rhythm is sustained while a new note is struck by the repetition of the noun. So it is also with the word "wisdom," which runs through the first chapter of the first epistle, and is ever cropping into view, and so it is often in the second epistle, as in the beginning of the second chapter, where "comfort" is the predominant idea, mentioned and mentioned again as bearing on himself under peculiar and unwonted weaknesses and sorrows.

In 2 Cor. i, 3, 4, uniformity of rendering is well preserved and the Pauline style is at once recognized, but the effect is soon marred, for "comfort" becomes "consolation" in verse 5, twice in verse 6, and once in verse 7, while the word rendered "tribulation" in verse 4 is "trouble" in verse 8. It may be added, that the translators followed no fixed principle in the renderings, "affliction" and "tribulations," for "tribulation," occurs only in Romans and in the Apocalypse. Though "comfort" is rightly kept four times in verse 4, "tribulation" is wrongly changed into "trouble," another Greek word being employed in verse 7, which is rightly rendered "sufferings." In the beginning of the second chapter "sorrow" is uppermost; one term occurs seven times, the result of intense emotion which does not shrink from disclosing itself by such a monotone of utterance; but the apostle's characteristic style is so far hidden, for the term occurring seven times is represented by "heaviness," "sorry," "sorrow," "grieved,"

"caused grief," "grieved," the two last being a translation of the same tense of the verb in two consecutive clauses. The word rendered "heaviness" in the first verse is "sorrow" in the third verse and all through the Epistle. In ii, 16, the apostle exclaims, under an awful sense of responsibility, "Who is sufficient for these things," and then, after a short digression, the answer is given in iii, 5, "our sufficiency is of God," but the unity of thought is distorted when, in the next clause, the cognate verb is rendered "who hath made us able ministers." Tyndale has "who is mete unto these things?" "our ableness cometh from God, which hath made us able to minister." The same rendering of the prominent terms should be kept: "our sufficiency"—"who hath made us sufficient as ministers." Our version has followed the Genevan throughout.

2 Cor. i, 11, is pervaded by the idea of ministration, and the version is so far uniform; but in verse 12, the privilege of free and bold speech is introduced as a distinctive glory of the apostolate in contrast with Moses and his economy, and then the term "veil" dominates the next paragraph. "The veil on his face," "the veil untaken away" in the reading of the Old Testament; "the veil upon their hearts," "the veil shall be taken away," and then in the last verse comes the practical application of this imagery; the point and beauty of which are lost by a change of rendering—"we all with open face," instead of "we all with unveiled face." After he had spoken to the people Moses veiled his face,¹ a symbol of the dim and transitory nature of the typical economy, but the apostles appear ever with unveiled face. The contrast of the apostles to the veiled prophet is obscured by the rendering "open face." The idea reappears in the third verse of the next chapter, but its connection with the previous illustration is lost again by the change of rendering, for the clause should be "if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled," &c.; the "hid" in the second verse is the right translation of a different term. In v, 6, there is a remarkable contrast stated in these terms, "absent

¹ The meaning of Exodus xxxiv, 33, is perverted by the word "till" printed in italics.

from the body"—"present with the Lord," and in verse 8, the terms are repeated, "present or absent," but the rendering in the intermediate verse 6 is "at home in the body," and the English reader may not perceive that the words "at home" are represented by the word which is twice given as "present." A uniform translation should have been kept throughout, even though it would be difficult to do it. Variations are also found in the older versions. The thought that fills the apostle's mind in verses 9, 10, 11, of the same chapter, is that of manifestation, "made manifest unto you"—"made manifest in your consciences," but the same verb gets a different rendering in verse 10, and the connection is darkened. The right translation, to be in harmony with verse 11, should be, "we must all be made manifest¹ before the judgment seat of Christ." The verb is so translated in the majority of instances. It is used of our Lord and his saved ones in Col. iii, 4, and it occurs again and again in this epistle, "open disclosure," noted and visible exhibition, without the veil or shadow which belongs to hidden things. In vi, 18, the point, though not the sense of the pronoun, is lost by a needless change in the rendering of the preposition, as if it were a possessive pronoun, "I will be a Father unto you," and the next clause should have been "and ye shall be sons and daughters unto me," as both clauses present the same relationship. In viii, 10, 11, the same infinitive which is translated "to be forward" in the first verse, is "to will" in the second; and the noun which is translated "readiness" in verse 11, is rendered "a willing mind" in verse 12. These variations occur also in the older versions with the exception of the Rheims. In x, 13, 15, 16, the same noun in a compact paragraph is twice rendered "rule"² and then "line of things." The other versions, as may be expected, vary also; Tyndale and the Bishops' have "rule" in the three cases, the Genevan has "line" in the last instance, "another man's line," "that is in the things that are prepared already," and this probably influenced King James's revisers. In xii, 2, 3, the same verb is translated "knew"³ and then "tell," and the process being

¹ φανερώω.

² κανών.

³ οἶδα, which means "I know." Veitch's Greek Verbs, p. 192.

immediately reversed, it is next rendered first "tell," and then "knoweth." In the same chapter, verse 9, the Lord's answer is "my strength is made perfect in weakness." The apostle at once snatches up and re-echoes the Lord's last assuring words, "most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my weaknesses, that the strength of Christ may rest upon me," but the connection and correspondence are masked in the English version, for "strength" is changed into "power," and "weaknesses" into "infirmities." Our translators followed the Bishops'; Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Great Bible preserve the uniformity.

In Gal. iii, 22, 23, the same Greek term is rendered "concluded" in the one verse and "shut up" in the other; the change from Latin to Saxon was gratuitous, and the literal or Latin sense of the Greek term is not in common use. Among the older versionists Coverdale preserves uniformity

In Phil. ii, 13, the participle rendered "that worketh" in one clause, has, in the other clause, its verb in the infinitive rendered "to do"—the response of man's co-operation to God's operation is in this way weakened—while a different verb is rendered "work" in the last clause of the previous verse. In iii, 6, the preposition given as "concerning" in the first clause becomes "touching" in the second; and while the noun is "gain" in verse 7, the verb is rendered "win" in verse 8.

In 1 Thess. i, the noun rendered "mention" in the first verse becomes "remembrance" in the second, and in iii, 6. The first rendering occurs four times, and the second three times, in the Epistles of Paul. The same verb is rendered "came" and then "were" in verse 5 of the first chapter, "became" in the following verse, and "were" again in verse 7.

In 2 Thess. ii, 6, 7, the neuter participle is given in the one verse as "what withholdeth," and the masculine participle as "he who letteth" in the next verse. "Letteth" came in with Coverdale and the Great Bible of 1539.

In Heb. i, 1, the same term in composition is first "sundry" and then "divers," the correct sense being "many"—"in many parts and many ways"—a vivid description of the origin and

structure of the Old Testament. The reading of the Authorized Version is that of the Genevan followed by the Bishops'. The last clause of iii, 11, is rendered "they shall not enter into my rest," and the reader is perplexed by the rendering of the same clause twice in iv, 3, 5, by these terms, "if they shall enter into my rest," and is apt to imagine there is some difference in the Greek. The rendering, "if they shall enter,"¹ is a literal translation of the Greek, which imitates the form of the original threatening in Num, xiv, 23, 30, repeated in Psalm xcv. The idiom, as an intense negation, is a form of solemn Hebrew oath, and needed not to have been followed in one place and abandoned in the other places. Tyndale does not use the conditional form, nor Coverdale, nor the Great Bible. In Num. xiv, 23, the Authorized Version has "surely they shall not see," and in Psalm xcv, 11, "that they should not enter." The Genevan introduced the literal and unidiomatic imitation, "if they shall enter." The Bishops' followed, and the Rheims reproduced the Latin. The verb rendered "he hath made old" in the first clause of viii, 13, has its participle translated in the next clause "decayeth," dimming to the reader the connection between statement and inference. The word which in Acts is twice rendered "prince" is translated "captain" in ii, 10, and "author" in xii, 2.

No mere English reader could suppose that in James ii, 2, 3, "goodly apparel" and "gay clothing" represented the same Greek phrase, which is also rendered "bright clothing" in Acts x, 30, where, indeed, as it is the glittering robe of an angel that is described, neither "gay" nor "goodly" would have been a suitable epithet. The Authorized Version, in these places, only followed the example of its predecessors, the Rheims excepted.

The phrase in 1 Peter i, 7, "at the appearing of Jesus Christ" passes into a truer version in verse 13, "at the revelation of Jesus Christ."

In 2 Pet. ii, 1, the genitive noun which appears in the epithet "damnable" in the first clause,² reappears in the

¹ εἰ εἰσελευσονται.

² ἀπωλείας.

accusative in the last clause as "destruction," and again, in verse 3 as "damnation," the idea of retaliatory penalty being lost in the alteration. Our translators themselves seem to have introduced the variation; the Protestant versions have "damnable," "damnation," and the Rheims has "perdition" in both places. According to the text which our translators preferred, the word again occurs in the first clause of the second verse, and they vary the rendering by using "pernicious," but add, in the margin, "lascivious ways, as some copies read."

In 1 John ii, 20, the noun translated "unction" becomes "anointing" twice in verse 27. "Unction" was taken from the Rheims,—Wycliffe has "anoyntyng" in both places. In v, 9, the verb has one rendering and its noun another no less than three times, so that the idiomatic connection is destroyed. The clause might have been, "the witness of God which he hath witnessed concerning his Son."

In Rev. i, 15, the noun used twice in the same clause has two renderings—it should be "his voice as the voice of many waters." In iii, 17, the adjective rendered "rich" has its verb translated "increased with goods" in the next clause. In iv, 4, the same noun in the very same clause is rendered "throne" and then "seats"—"round about the throne were four-and-twenty seats." The change obscures the similarity of honour on the part of the redeemed to that of the Redeemer, according to his own promise in Matt. xix, 28, "when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones." The change of "throne" into "seats," as if the honour were too godlike, was brought in by the Genevan, and followed by the Bishops'; Tyndale, Coverdale, the Great Bible, and the Genevan Testament of 1557 having "seat"—"seats," the Rheims having a strange variation, the reverse of the Authorized, "and round about the seate four-and-twentie seates, and upon the thrones four-and-twentie seniors sitting," following their Vulgate, the reading also of the Codex Amiatinus. Modern [editions of the Rheims have been conformed to the Authorized, with "ancients" also for "elders." In xiii, 13, 14, the same noun

is rendered "wonders" and then "miracles," both being mis-translations of a term which really denotes "signs." The term is inconsistently rendered "sign" in xv, i, "I saw another sign in heaven," that is, an additional sign, but to any previous sign the Authorized Version gives no clue. Two signs are indeed spoken of in xii, 1, 3, but in both the places the translation is "wonder," and therefore the reference in xv, 1, is really lost. In xviii, 2, in the one clause a noun is translated "hold," and in the next clause "cage," as if to bring it into harmony with "bird"; and there is an unwarranted variation in the use of the article, "the hold," "a cage," the words being both indefinite in the original.

CHAPTER LIII.

ON the other hand, one English term represents several Greek words, and many important distinctions sink out of view. But it is at once to be conceded, that the English language has not such a wealth of vocables as to supply a distinct term for every Greek noun or verb. We are therefore forced to use the same translation for different words in the original.

Thus three Greek substantives are represented by the one rendering "net," meaning different shapes of the implement, and the distinction could only be brought out by the addition of some epithet.¹ "care," "careth,"² 1 Pet. v, 7, stands for two Greek words; Matt. xiii, 17, "see" is the translation of two verbs;³ "reap" stands for two verbs in James v, 4,⁴ and "know" for two verbs in Acts xix, 15.⁵ "Servant" represents seven Greek nouns, which, though distinguishable in meaning, have not each a distinct English equivalent. In Luke xvi, 2, 3, the same verb is rendered "said," in verse 5 another verb is rendered "said";⁶ the first verb occurs twice in verse 6, and twice in verse 7, along with that used in verse 5. Sometimes, however, a distinction is made, and in this case it could not be avoided, Acts xxvi, 14, "a voice speaking unto me, saying." The same English pronoun represents two different Greek ones in 1 John iii, 3, "this hope in *him*,"⁷ and "as *he* is pure"; and it would

¹ δίκτυον, ἀμφίβληστρον, σαγήνη.

² μεριμνάω, μέλει.

³ ἰδεῖν, βλέπετε.

⁴ ἀμησάντων, θερισάντων.

⁵ γινώσκω, ἐπίσταμαι.

⁶ εἶπεν, λάλει.

⁷ αὐτός, ἐκεῖνος, the last pronoun of constant occurrence in the writings of St. John.

be very difficult to preserve the distinction in English. Two words are rendered "purse,"¹ the one being a bag, Luke x, 4, the other the girdle, in the folds of which was the pouch, Matt. x, 9. "Received" stands for two Greek verbs in the same verse, 1 Thess. ii, 13, but the second might be rendered "accepted." "Money"² represents five Greek nouns, but the distinction could not be easily kept in all cases,—silver money, bronze money, small coin or change, money sanctioned or current money applied to the tribute, and money in the sense of "the useful." "Tribute" represents three nouns, but one might be given literally as half-shekel, Matt. xvii, 24, 27, the tax paid for the support of the temple, the piece of money found in the mouth of the fish, being a stater, sufficing therefore for both Peter and his Master. It is impossible to find any other than the one word for the heathen altar in Acts xvii, 23, and for the Jewish altar so often referred to. We have no word but "basket" to represent, first, one term employed in the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand, and, second, another term employed in the miracle of feeding the four thousand, Matt. xiv, 20, xv, 37.³ The first term is a smaller vessel, like that which the people in Palestine still carry with them, and the second is a larger vessel. Nay, the two terms are put in contrast in Matt. xvi, 9, 10, and in Mark viii, 19, 20, in two successive clauses of the same interrogation, and "basket" does service for both. The second was like a "hamper" or "pannier" which meant originally "bread-basket," "panarium," and we have in the Bishops' Bible, Job xxxix, 31, "canst thou fill the basket with his skinne? or the fish pannier with his head?" in our version with a very different rendering, Job xli, 7. The earlier versions do not attempt a distinction, but the Rheims has "maundes" for the second word, a term yet preserved in Maundy Thursday. A third noun, rendered "basket" in 2 Cor. xi, 33, means a receptacle formed of ropes.

"Brightness"⁴ represents three Greek nouns, the first of

¹ βαλάντιον, ζώνη.

³ κόφινος, σπιρίς.

² ἀργύριον, χαλκός, κέρμα, νόμισμα, χρῆμα.

⁴ ἀπαύγασμα, λαμπρότης, ἐπιφάνεια.

which is brightness rayed or flashed out—effulgence not reflection, Heb. i, 3; the second is the brightness which shines as of the sun, Acts xxvi, 13; and the third is a mistranslation of a word which denotes only appearance, 2 Thess. ii, 8.

“Crown”¹ stands for two substantives quite different in character; the one in its English form is the diadem occurring three times in Revelation. Thus in xix, 12, where it is the imperial diadem—“on his head are many diadems,” that is, on the head of the royal Conqueror, King of kings, and Lord of lords. The great Red Dragon, the hieroglyph of the Prince of Evil, has on his seven heads “seven diadems,” and the portentous organism coming out of the sea, which he inspires, has also seven diadems, for it represents imperial Rome. The other term, occurring eighteen times, is the crown or chaplet, won and worn by the victor; the crown of righteousness, of glory, of life; and that of gold which the saints cast at the feet of Him that sits on the throne.

“People” represents four terms of distinct signification,² not to be confounded, while it has also the general sense of populace, or the public, and often as distinct from the rulers. The first is often applied to the Jewish people as opposed to the Gentiles, Matt. ii, 6; Luke ii, 10, 32; Acts xxvi, 23; the second is the enfranchised people in their civil capacity, or as a regular assembly—assembled in the forum, Acts xvii, 5; xix, 30; the third, while it has also a general meaning of people or inhabitants, signifies often, and specially, the Gentiles, Luke ii, 32; Matt. iv, 15; x, 5; but the noun, which is properly “multitude,” might always preserve its true signification.

“Godhead,” in Romans i, 20, Acts xvii, 29, and Colossians ii, 9, represents three Greek words—that in Romans being different from that found in Acts and Colossians.³ The first term, according to its origin, refers to quality, not to essence; it is divineness, *divinitas*; proved from possession of certain attributes—such as eternity and omnipotence. But the second term, according to its origin, refers to essence—*deitas*, absolute

¹ διάδημα, στέφανος.

² λαός, δῆμος, ἔθνος, ὄχλος.

³ θεϊότης, τὸ θεῖον, θεότης.

and personal. This Godhead dwells in Christ, not fractionally, but in its fulness. This Divine Essence cannot be imaged out in metal or in marble. Spirituality is lost in the attempt to make it palpable to sense.

“True” represents two adjectives quite different in meaning, and for which we have not separate English equivalents. The one is “true” in the ordinary sense of the epithet, as in John iii, 33;¹ viii, 17; Romans iii, 4—true in contrast to what is false; God is true, he cannot lie. But the other term is rather “genuine” or “real,” John iv, 37—all it or he professes to be—the substantial, as opposed to the shadowy, as in Hebrews viii, 2; ix, 24; 1 Thess. i, 9, “to serve the living and true God”—true is opposed to idols or fictitious divinities, “very God.” Archbishop Trench refers to the “very” of the Wycliffite version, but he might have referred to a more recent date, within half a century of the present version, as the Genevan of 1560 has in John xvii, 3, “that they might know thee to be the onely verie God,” in 1 John v, 20, “this same is verie God and eternal life.” Nay, the word is found several times in the present version, though it does not stand for this Greek adjective—“Genesis xxvii, 21, “my very son Esau”; Proverbs xvii, 9, “separateth very friends”; and similarly in John vii, 26, and Acts ix, 22.

“Temple” represents three words, which might, however, be distinguished in a translation.² The first is in Luke xi, 51, where the word is “house”—“which perished between the altar and the house,” the altar being in the open fore court, and the house meaning the sacred edifice itself, rendered “temple,” as in all the older versions; Wycliffe, however, has “house.” The second term signifies the building itself, the sanctuary, or the dwelling-place of God. Thus in Matt. xxiii, 35, “between the temple—that is, the sanctuary—and the altar,” but the altar itself was in the temple, in its larger sense; Mark xv, 38, “the vail of the sanctuary,” which was the partition between the holy and the most holy place. The third word signifies the whole cluster of buildings—the precincts, house, portico, cloisters, and rooms of all sorts—all that was within

¹ ἀληθής, ἀληθινός.

² τοῦ οἴκου, ναός, ἱερὸν.

the holy enclosure—Matt. iv, 5, “pinnacle of the temple”; xxi, 14, “the lame came to him in the temple”; John ii, 14, 15, “found in the temple them that sold oxen,” and “drove them all out of the temple”; Mark xi, 27, “as he was walking in the temple.” These expressions cannot refer to the sanctuary properly so called, into which the priests alone could enter, so that the three terms need not be identified in any English translation.

“Life” represents two Greek terms,¹ which have distinctive senses; the one is physical life as opposed to death, and sometimes the divine life—eternal life—the life of God; but it is once rendered “lifetime” in Luke xvi, 25: the other noun rendered “life” meaning course of life, or duration; “*this* life,” Luke viii, 14; “*our* life,” 1 Peter iv, 3. It is also given as “living”—that is, means of life, Matt. xii, 44; Luke viii, 43; xv, 12, 30, and it is translated “good”—“this world’s good,” 1 John iii, 17, after all the older versions, and the *substantia* of the Vulgate.

It is to be regretted that some distinction was not made between the neuter in the first clause and the masculine in the last clause of John i, 11—“He came to his own, and his own received him not”—the first his own possessions, or home, and the second his own people.

The touching paragraph in John xxi, 15-17, loses, in our version, no little of its tenderness. The word in Christ’s first two questions rendered “love” is not that used in Peter’s three replies, though it is also rendered “love.” The verb used by Jesus is the one which is uniformly employed to describe man’s love to God, and has in it the idea of awe and devout reverence, which its object must inspire from His unapproachable majesty. Jesus says by this verb “Lovest thou me?”² Peter feels that the Master is near him, that he has forgiven him the denial, that he has restored him to his old and happy position, and that his affection for him is therefore not only very fervent, but is the love of a human heart to a living person, and he answers, “I love thee.”³ The

¹ ζῳή, βίος.² ἀγαπᾶς με.³ φιλῶ σε.

question and response are repeated, but the third time Jesus in gracious condescension uses Peter’s own term, and he replies at once, “Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee.” And there is another change unmarked in our version: the charge is, “Feed my lambs, feed my sheep, feed my sheep.” But “feed” in the second charge translates a different term from that found in the first and third charge,¹ and it denotes more than feeding—the exercise of other parts of the shepherd’s work, folding as well as feeding, protection as well as guidance to the green pastures and still waters.

“New” represents two different adjectives, and the identity cannot well be helped. The terms are interchanged both being applied to “wine,” “covenant,” and “man.” But the one² has the idea of time in it—thus, a “new man” is one who has just been spiritually changed, his spiritual birth recently past. The second has the additional element of quality in relation to his former life, when the “old man” reigned within him. And so with “wine,” it may be new compared with last year’s vintage, or new as compared with itself after time has mellowed it, Matt. ix, 17. So the covenant may be new in the age of it, as Hebrews xii, 24, or new in the character of it, compared with the worn-out dispensation which preceded it,³ Hebrews ix, 15. But the adjective rendered “new” in Matt. ix, 16, is really “undressed,”⁴ and might be so rendered. “Raw, or undressed” is in the margin, after the margin of the Geneva, and a distinction might be kept in the following clause—“they put new wine into fresh skins.”

“Light” represents no less than six different terms. The first of these⁵ is rightly so translated, and it occurs very often, as may be expected in a revelation which is a light from Him who is light. The second term,⁶ occurring three times, is also of necessity rendered “light,” though it means secondary light of the moon, or a lamp, Matt. xxiv, 29; Mark xiii, 24; Luke xi, 33. The third term,⁷ used fourteen times, and eight times

¹ ποιμαίνε.² νέος.³ καινός.⁴ ἀγναφός.⁵ φῶς.⁶ φέγγος.⁷ λύχνος.

rendered "candle," and six times "light," should rather be "lamp"—"the lamp of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light." The fourth term¹ is "lamp," or "torch," rendered "lights" in Acts xx, 8, seven times "lamp," and once "torches." The fifth term² is properly "luminary"—"light-giver," as in Philippians ii, 15, and Rev. xxi, 11. Compare Genesis i, 14-16. The phrase "her light" in the last passage is, as has been remarked, very ambiguous. It might mean the light shed by the city, whereas it is what the light shed upon it. Another noun,³ translated "light," certainly, as its form implies, means "enlightenment"—2 Cor. iv. 4, "the enlightenment of the gospel of the glory of God"; "the enlightenment of the glory of God," 6. In these cases the enlightenment is not knowledge possessed by the apostles themselves, but the effect of instruction given by them to others.

The following monosyllabic particles simply, or in composition, have a wide representative sweep, often vague and miscellaneous, and often giving the sense in spite of the variations. Thus "at" represents 11 Greek particles, "of" 13, "in" 14, "on" 9, "by" 11, "with" 13, "for" 13, "about" 5, "after" 6, "upon" 7, "from" 6, "above" 5, "over" 8, "against" 10, "into" 6, "among" 11, "toward" 6, "through" 6, "till" 7. "Afterwards" represents 6 Greek adverbs or conjunctions, "and" 9 Greek terms, "always" 8, "nevertheless" 5, "though" 8, "so" 10, "also" 6, "but" 12, "yet" 10, "wherefore" 12, "while" 8, "therefore" 13, "save" 5, "because" 9. "For" represents 5 Greek conjunctions, "as" 20 Greek terms closely allied to each other, "even" represents 6 Greek particles, and "even as" the same number.

Some of the common verbs do service for a great variety of Greek terms. Thus, apart from several idiomatic uses, such as "come down," "come nigh," "come by," &c., "come" serves for 32 different Greek terms, but in this way the sense is often obscured; "depart" for 21 terms, several of them compounds of the same verb. Apart from similar idiomatic uses, such as

¹ λαμπάς,² φωστήρ.³ φωτισμός.

"give audience," "give heed," &c., give represents 14 Greek verbs, six of them allied to one another, but as many having no connection. "Make" represents 13 Greek verbs, and is over 70 times employed as auxiliary to nouns and other verbs, as "make ashamed," "make war," "make merry," "make melody," "make whole," "make ado," "make mad," &c. "Receive" represents 17 Greek verbs, and is used in other ways, "to receive damage," "law," "seed," and as auxiliary of other verbs. "Go" stands for 16 Greek verbs, apart from its employment in such phrases as "go abroad," "go astray"; "go out" representing 5 verbs, "go up" 4, and "go about" 6. "Abide" represents 10 Greek verbs. "Speak" stands for 8 Greek verbs, apart from such uses as in the phrases "speak out," "speak with," "speak against," which does service for 2 verbs, "speak before" for 2, and "speak evil" for 3. "Stand" represents 7 Greek verbs, several of which are connected in origin, besides other forms, such as "stand in doubt," "stand round about," &c. "Leave" represents 9 Greek verbs, 4 of which are of common origin. "Take" represents 21 Greek verbs, besides being found in such phrases as "take care," "take counsel," "take thought," &c.; "take heed" represents 2 verbs, "take away" 1 verb with 5 compounds, "take up" represents 8, and "understand" 9. "Show" represents 20 verbs, and is in many cases an inappropriate rendering, the various meanings and shades of meaning being wholly neglected. "Lay" stands for 8 Greek verbs, besides being used in such phrases as "lay aside," "lay down," "lay on," "lay even with the ground," "lay up," which represents 3 different verbs, and "lay wait." "Kill" represents 6 different Greek verbs, which are also rendered by "slay." "Keep" represents 12 Greek verbs, besides being used in such phrases as "keep the feast," "keep back," "keep silence," "keep close," "keep company." "Behold" represents 12 Greek verbs, "break" 9, "call" 12, "carry" 7, "catch" 9, "change" 8, "continue" 13, besides such renderings as "continue in," and "instant in" or "with," "command" stands for 8, "declare" 14, "deliver" 11, "consider" 11, "bring" 13, "bring forth" 15, apart from such renderings of other verbs as "bring again," "bring down," "bring low," "out," "safe," "together," "up," and "upon," &c.

"Appoint" represents 10 Greek verbs, several of which are of common origin.

"Stranger" represents five words, having the same general meaning, with specific shades of signification.

Of the four words rendered "punishment," the first is satisfaction as a matter of right and justice, 1 Peter ii, 14; the second is infliction of penalty, Matt. xxv, 46; the third is originally damages assessed upon a citizen, 2 Cor. ii, 6; and the last is castigation, Hebrews x, 29. "Serve" stands for four verbs, of which one signifies specially divine service;¹ "service" stands for three nouns, two of which belong to the verb just referred to, and the other is often used with a hallowed limitation.² In James i, 17, "gift"³ represents two Greek nouns generically the same,—the Genevan has for the first word "every good giving."

This translation of several Greek terms by the one English term does not characterize nouns to the same extent. But "child" represents 6 terms, "judgment" 8, "mind" 7, "destruction" 4, "disease" 4, "world" 4, "offence" 4, "power" 6, "raiment" 5, "robe" 4, "tempest" 4, "work" 5, "end" 5, "light" 6, "lust" 4, "man" 4, apart from such phrases as "a man," "no man," "any man," "every man," "a certain man," &c., "country" 5, "craft" 4, and "garment" 4. The following represents each three Greek nouns, "dearth," "conversation," "damsel," "gain," "curse," "flood," "fruit," "fellow," "minister," "slaughter," and "wave." Two Greek nouns are both rendered "unbelief," the first of them uniformly and correctly, and the second of them is three times rendered, as it ought to be, "disobedience," but as often "unbelief." "Then,"⁴ in John xi, 12, 14, represents two different Greek adverbs, the one temporal and the other logical. There are four words rendered "likewise," and the meaning is well given "in like manner." The adverb which occurs so often, is used only in this sense in the New Testament, but as in modern English it simply means "also," its scriptural meaning is often overlooked. In this case

¹ λειτουργέω.

² λατρεία.

³ δόσις, δώρημα.

⁴ οὕν, so common in St. John, might be, in very many cases, distinguished from τότε, in translation.

a fuller form of translation might now be given, especially in all places where "also" and "likewise" are found in the same verse, as Heb. ii, 14, "as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same,"—not only "also" but "likewise"—in the very same way.

Of the words rendered "child," one is "babe"¹ and is four times so rendered, once "young children," once "child" in 2 Tim. iii, 15, in reference to Timothy, and in Acts it refers to the Hebrew babes cast into the Nile. The diminutive "little child"² is often so rendered, but it is simply "children" in the account of the two miraculous banquets, and it becomes "damsel" in Mark v, 41, the epithet applied to the daughter of Jairus. A third term is rightly rendered "babe"³ in the Gospels, but is also rendered "child" seven times, the word having also a figurative signification, as in Matt. xi, 25, xxi, 16, 1 Cor. iii, 1. A fourth term is uniformly rendered "little children";⁴ and a fifth, "child,"⁵ "children," used more than ninety times, is sometimes translated "son," as in Luke xv, 31, xvi, 25, and is applied to Timothy, though it might be translated "child" in most of the places, as in 1 Cor. iv, 14, "my beloved children," and in verse 17, "Timotheus, who is my beloved child." In fact, our version sometimes renders the term which ought to be "sons" by "children," and sometimes that which ought to be "children" by "sons," and thus obliterates an important distinction between John and Paul, the former only using "child" as applied to believers, and the latter "sons." The two last words are identified in 1 Cor. xiv, 20, and the point is lost in our version, "Be not children in understanding, howbeit in malice be ye children," whereas the sense is "howbeit in malice be ye babes." The Authorized Version has very properly "children" in the margin of 1 Peter iii, 6, where it has in the text "daughters," the true rendering being "Sarah, of whom ye became children." The English translation suggests the wrong idea, that by imitating Sarah's example they would earn the title of Sarah's daughters. The translation of another

¹ βρέφος.

⁴ τέκνιον.

² παιδίον.

³ νήπιος.

⁵ τέκνον.

term varies between "child" and "servant," it being once "menservants," three times "son," once "young man," and twice "maiden," "maid." The term certainly means children, male and female, in all the ages of childhood, and as certainly it means sometimes also "servants," our word "boy" having a similar ambiguity. The higher sense of service also belongs to it, as applied twice to David in Luke i, 69, and Acts iv, 25; to Israel in Luke i, 54, to the predicted Messiah in Matt. xii, 18, and to Jesus in Acts iii, 13, 26; and in those last places it should be rendered "servant,"¹ the reference being to the Messianic or official character. The epithet is never used of the apostles. "Son" might be preserved even where it is now rendered "child," as in the Hebrew idiom "sons of the bride-chamber," "sons of the kingdom," "Zebedee's sons," for we have "Peter and the two sons of Zebedee," "sons of this world"; but "children of Israel" is a phrase too familiar to be easily changed.

Two words are rendered "immortality,"² but one is properly "incorruptness" or "incorruptibility," in Romans ii, 7, and 2 Tim. i, 10.

"Sickness" represents three terms, which all signify indisposition or chronic debility. One is actual ailment and is often rendered "diseases," a second is rendered "sickness," and a third may mean the weakness caused by sickness, as in Luke vii, 10, and it is often rendered "infirmity." Its adjective is an epithet applied to conscience, and could not well be rendered "sick," 1 Cor. viii, 7, and to a brother possessed of slender knowledge and feeble self-regulative power, verse 11.

The very unfortunate translation of "beasts"³ in the Apocalypse has often been noticed. These "living" ones were composite or cherubic creatures stationed in the immediate presence of God, "in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne," Rev. iv, 6—forms of life ever in fellowship with the absolute Life, the throned Lifegiver. The other "beasts"⁴ of the same book are symbols of dark and terrible earth-powers,

¹ παῖς.

² ἀφθαρσία, ἀθανασία.

³ ζῶον.

⁴ θηρίον—"beast," or "monster," occurring over thirty-five times.

noted for rebellion and persecution, for ferocious impiety, and for an awful and ominous downfall and penalty. The Rhemists must have been under a strong delusion, for in their Latin copy they had "animalia" and "bestia," and our own revisers had "living creatures" in the first chapter of Ezekiel. Perhaps the translation was suggested by the form of these animal figures—the lion, ox, eagle, and man, wrought into one figure,—emblems frequent in all the oriental forms of worship.

Two adjectives are both rendered "poor." The one occurs only once in 2 Cor. ix, 9, and means a poor man, a pauper, and also several times in the Septuagint; but the other term means beggars in Luke xvi, 20, 22, while another participle is used in John ix, 8.

"Dead"¹ represents two Greek words which vary in signification. There is the simple verb used only in the perfect, and its commoner compound, which means "to die." The simple verb is usually translated "dead." The compound is often and rightly rendered by "die." The aorist cannot often be rendered in this way, Mark v, 35, or Luke viii, 49, where the perfect is used. But in Luke xvi, 22, and in the story told to Christ of the luckless woman seven times widowed, in Luke xx, the proper translation is preserved, and it would have been better to have preserved this rendering in John vi, 49, 58, "Your fathers ate manna in the wilderness and died," as is done in viii, 21, "ye shall die in your sins," and in many other places. In Rom. vi, vii, viii, this is the proper rendering, not "is" or "are dead," but "died": "we died to sin," "died to the law," 2 Cor. v, 14; "if one died for all, then all died," Galatians ii, 19; Colossians ii, 20, "if ye died with Christ"; rightly in 2 Cor. vi, 9, "as dying, and behold we live." The adjective,² however, refers to the state, and is always rendered "dead."

Two words are rendered "world" without distinction; the one is "world" always, but with varying senses—as the globe, the population upon it, especially as now conditioned by sin

¹ θνήσκω, ἀποθνήσκω.

putting to death of Jesus; what put

² νεκρός. νέκρωσις is more than Jesus to death was ever expected to "the dying"—2 Cor. iv, 10, is the seize and martyr them.

and alienation from God. The other, meaning "age," oftenest occurs in a temporal sense, as in the phrase, "for ever and evermore," &c., and is also sometimes rendered "world," as in Matt. xii, 32; Mark iv, 19; Luke xx, 34; 1 Cor. i, 20; 2 Cor. iv, 4. It would be impossible to put "age" in many of the places, or to give it an ethical sense. We have also the two words in one clause in Eph. ii. 2, "according to the course of this world."¹

"Will" is at once the auxiliary in the formation of the English future, but it also represents two different Greek verbs,² so that the distinction cannot be always marked by the English reader. Thus in Matt. xi, 27, "and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" reads like a simple future, but it is to whom the Son willeth to reveal him. In some cases, the rendering is "would" (Acts xvii, 20), "would know," and sometimes it is "intended" (Acts xii, 4), and "disposed" (1 Cor. x, 27). "They that will be rich," is really "they that would be, or desire to be, rich," 1 Tim. vii, 9. So with the second Greek verb in Matt. v, 40, "If any man will sue thee at the law," is not a supposed future occurrence, as the English might imply, but, "if any man would sue thee." In Matt. xvi, 24, "If any man willeth to come after me"—his own volition and purpose being contained in this verb. The use of "would" might tend to remove the dubiety in Matt. xv, 32; xix, 17, 21; xx, 14; Mark x, 43.³ John viii, 44, is no mere prediction—"The lusts of your father ye will do," but it is "ye will to do." Acts vii, 28, "Wilt thou kill me?" is no simple future, but is "willest thou to kill me?" Matt. xv, 32, "I will not send them away fasting," better, "I would not send them." Twice the phrase occurs, "I will

¹ κόσμος, αἰών.

² βούλομαι, θέλω. Μέλλω, followed by an infinitive, is often rendered as a simple future, while its more distinctive sense might be in many cases preserved, as is done in John iv, 47.

³ Mr. Earle says "that in these

instances no question of Greek is involved." Surely the mere future of a Greek verb does differ from a finite verb connected with an infinitive following. Philology of the English Tongue, p. 203, Oxford, 1871.

have mercy," Matt. xii, 7, Romans ix, 15, but with a wide difference of meaning. In the first place it is, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice," on the part of man; in the second case, the phrase is the simple future, an expression of God's sovereign procedure.

"Weep" represents two verbs,¹ the one of which is of common occurrence, and is once rendered "bewail" in Rev. xviii, 9; the other² occurs only once, and in that shortest and most memorable verse, "Jesus wept," John xi, 35. Such a verse, so familiar, so pregnant with assurance of His fellow-feeling, it would be, perhaps, impossible to alter. The other verb is applied to Mary and the Jews; Jewish mourners wail rather than weep, and in the midst of this demonstrative sorrow, and in sympathy with it, His bosom heaved, His eye filled, and Jesus shed tears. "Strong crying and tears" in Heb. v, 7, are associated apparently in reference to the agony of Gethsemane.

"Servant," in the parable in Matt. xxii, represents two different words—first, the class that summoned the invited guests, human agents, verses 3, 4, 8, and 10; and then the class that execute the penal sentence, and are angelic ministers. The distinction between "servant" and "minister" is found in Tyndale, the Great Bible, the Genevan of 1557, and the Bishops', but was obliterated by Coverdale and by the Genevan of 1560. The Authorized Version is without excuse, for in Mark x, 43, 44, it has both "minister" and "servant."

The word "judge" represents three allied Greek verbs, and puzzles the reader in 1 Cor. xi, 31, 32, "for if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged," "but when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord."³ The verb means "discerned," "if we had discerned ourselves we should not be judged," and the term is so rendered in verse 29, "not discerning the Lord's body." In verses 32 and 34 the words "condemned," "condemnation," stand for two different words, the former of which⁴ is properly rendered, but the latter⁵ is only judgment, and the

¹ κλαίω,

³ εἰ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα.

⁴ κατακριθῶμεν.

² δακρύω.

⁵ κρίμα, as in verse 29.

verb is properly translated in Romans ii, 1 and 3. "Judge" stands for two verbs, single and compound, in 1 Cor. iv, 3, 4, 5, "It is a small thing that I should be judged of you," "He that judgeth me is the Lord," "Therefore judge nothing before the time"; but the compound verb used in 3 and 4 does not mean "to judge," but to inquire into¹ (compare 1 Cor. x, 27, where it is given as "asking no question"). Its noun² signifies a preliminary examination before a judge, Acts xxv, 26, like what in Scottish law is called a "precognition." Similar mis-translations occur in 1 Cor. ii, 15, though a better translation is given in the last clause of the previous verse—"discerned."

"Wash" represents three Greek verbs, two of which may be distinguished as they occur in John xiii, 10, rendered in our version as in the older versions, "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit"—Jesus washed the feet of his disciples, Peter objected, but cried in the end, "not my feet only, but also my hands and my head," and the reply of Jesus is in the words quoted. But the first verb³ employed signifies the application of water to the whole body, as with the dead body of Dorcas according to Jewish ritual, Acts ix, 37, in the proverb quoted in 2 Peter ii, 22, and in Heb. x, 23, and Rev. i, 5. It means therefore to bathe, and the other verb⁴ means to wash a part of the body, as the face, Matt. vi, 17, the hands, Mark vii, 3, and the feet as in this paragraph, "He who is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet," as his feet touching the floor after he comes out of the bath may contract impurity. The third verb⁵ is usually connected with things, such as nets, Luke v, 2, robes, Rev. vii, 14, and according to another reading in Rev. xxii, 14.

The adjective "other" represents two distinct words, and these occur together in Gal. i, 6, 7, "so soon removed from him that called you unto another gospel, which is not another." The first epithet denotes distinction among individuals, and the second difference of kind, being so soon removed to a different gospel which, however, is not "another" or additional gospel;

¹ ἀνακρίνω.² ἀνάκρισις.³ λούω.⁴ νίπτω.⁵ πλύνω.

and similarly in 2 Cor. xi, 4, and 1 Cor. xv, 39, 40, 41. In the last place, the first adjective refers to things of different classes, generically different as celestial and terrestrial, and the second to objects of the same class, sun, moon, and stars.

"Remission" stands for two Greek nouns, the one of which occurs only once in Romans iii, 25,¹ the other is six times rendered "forgiveness" and nine times "remission." The first is rightly rendered in the margin of Romans iii, 25, "passing over"—it is not remission, but prætermission. The meaning is, God set Christ forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, for a declaration of His righteousness on account of the prætermission in the forbearance of God of the sins that went before. This long interval, prior to the advent of Christ, had witnessed no adequate exhibition of God's wrath against sin, therefore now, or "at this time," there was a very signal and awful manifestation of it in the blood of his Son. None of the early versions indicate the difference.

The translation in Romans xii, 2, "be not conformed . . . but be transformed," would lead the English reader to imagine that the Greek terms so rendered are the same verb compounded with different prepositions. But the verbs are very different in form altogether—"fashioned . . . transformed."

Two different terms² are both rendered "burden" in Gal. vi, 2, "bear ye one another's burdens," and verse 5, "every one shall bear his own burden." The first is "loads" which others in sympathy may help to carry; the second is the individual burden which each must carry for himself, sin, weakness, responsibility. The earlier English versions do not attempt to mark the distinction; the Vulgate has *onus* in both cases, and the Rheims therefore translates both substantives by "burden."

"Repent" represents two verbs,³ which occur together in 2 Cor. vii, 10, "Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of." Both verbs are always rendered "repent," though there is a very important distinction between them. The one is a term of deeper meaning and really

¹ πάρεσις, ἄφεσις.² βάρη, φορτίον.³ μετανοέω, μεταμέλομαι.

denotes change of mind, and in the New Testament the profound and vital change; while the other term is more superficial in nature, though it sometimes approaches the other in meaning. It is rather regret, "a repentance unto salvation not to be regretted," or remorse, as in the case of Judas, Matt. xxvii, 3. As Bengel remarks, "the first verb is put in the imperative, the second never."

In James i, 15, "bringeth forth" represents two different verbs;¹ "lust, when it hath conceived, bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." The first is rightly rendered, the image being that of the mother; but, in the second clause, sin, when it is perfected, begetteth death, the image is that of the father. Wycliffe and the Rheims, following the Latin, make a distinction by "conceived" and "gendreth," but the distinction is not imitated by any of the other versions.

The two verbs meaning generally "to do" and "to make" may be often distinguished in translation;² and several words referring to speech might be kept distinct.³ Other terms closely allied in meaning,⁴ and different verbs connected with vision,⁵ might also be marked. The rendering "I know" in Acts xix, 15, represents two different Greek verbs, which may and ought to be, distinguished. Canon Lightfoot proposes, "Jesus I acknowledge, and Paul I know." It would be difficult to preserve the distinction in any translation of 2 Cor. v, 16.

"Hell" represents two very different Greek nouns, Hades and Gehenna, the first of which is rendered "grave" in 1 Cor. xv, 35, where it is personified, and it sometimes approaches in sense to Gehenna, as in Matt. xi, 23, and in Luke xvi, 23. But it often means the other or spirit-world, the region of disembodied spirits, as in Acts ii, 27, 31, and in the Apocalypse, when death ceases, Hades comes to an end. Could "Hades" not now be naturalized? Is its meaning so well known that it might take its place in an English Bible? Hell, with the

¹ τίκτω, ἀποκνέω.

² ποιέω, πράσσω.

³ λαλέω, λέγω, εἶπον.

⁴ τηρέω, φυλάσσω; αἰτέω, ἐρωτάω.

⁵ βλέπω, ὁράω, θεωρέω, θεάομαι.

popular conception of it, is in many places a sad mistranslation. The older versions did not attempt to make any distinction.

"Devil" represents two terms, the one of them, the Greek form of the word "devil," occurs at least thirty-five times, and the other is the term "demon," the masculine form of which occurs only five times in the Received Text, but two of the instances are more than doubtful. The neuter form is the common one, especially in the Gospels, where it is found over fifty times, while in the succeeding books it occurs eight times. In Acts xvii, 18, it is rendered "gods." The correspondent verb is found only in the Gospels, and there thirteen times, and it is usually rendered "possessed with," or "of the devil" or "devils," and in John, where it is found only twice, the rendering is "that hath a devil." On the other hand the term "devil" has a literal and human application, as in John vi, 70, where, without the article, it is applied to Judas; in 1 Tim. iii, 11, where it occurs in the plural, and is translated "slanderers"; and in 2 Tim. iii, 3, and Titus ii, 3, where it is rendered "false accusers." But it has a special and emphatic use—"the devil"—never in the plural and always with the article, one being and one only having the terrible pre-eminence. The "demons" are spirits, "unclean," "evil," but he is Satan, the Tempter, the Enemy, the Adversary, the god of this world, the prince of this world, who has the power of death, the Old Serpent, the Great Dragon who deceiveth the world. Certain men are said to have these demons, to be demonized, or to be mobbed by them, Luke vi, 18, and the result of Christ's power was that the unclean spirit "came out,"—"Come out and enter no more into him." Possession was disease like epilepsy, for the victim was "healed"; and some kind of insanity, for the "right mind" was restored. But it was something more,—the intrusion of an alien force into the nervous system, impeding sensation, so that the patient was deaf and dumb, with perfect organs but without power to use them, his will overlorded by an alien might,¹ which created the confusion of an apparently dual consciousness. The rendering of the two distinct terms by the same word,

¹ καταδυναστεύω.

obliterates a very marked distinction to the English reader. The Wycliffite versions are not uniform, as in Matt xii, 24, both have "fiends," but in verse 27, "If I by Belzebub cast out devils." If Tyndale had ventured to introduce "demon," it would long since have been naturalized; and even now the distinction being generally understood, it might be safely introduced into an English version for personal and public reading.

"Miracles" stands for two terms,¹ which are occasionally confounded, while another noun always used in the plural is rendered "wonders." This first name is never directly given to any of Christ's miracles in the Gospels. It is once so employed along with the other terms in Acts ii, 22, to characterize Christ's miracles; and those done by the apostles, Heb. ii, 4; also those done by the man of sin, 2 Thess. ii, 9. The English term "miracle" is not very significant of the character of Christ's supernatural works, for the element of wonder was the least characteristic element in them: it was like the tolling of the bell to summon the people to worship. The second term denotes power, or the element of power inherent in those miracles. It is often translated "mighty works" in the synoptical Gospels, and in the other parts of the New Testament. But when used as a nominative, Mark vi, 14, the sense is, "the powers do work in him," and not "mighty works do show forth themselves in him." But the meaning of the word is completely lost when it is vaguely rendered "miracles" in Mark ix, 39; Acts ii, 22; viii, 13; xix, 11, &c. "Mighty works" should have been given in all these places. The third term, "sign," is the highest and most suggestive of all, and it is vaguely and variously rendered. The miracle was a "sign," or token of divine interposition, and that is the primal distinction. But the meaning and significance are quite lost by its being rendered more than twenty times "miracles," once in Luke xxiii, 8, and twelve times in John, so that one characteristic element of the style of the fourth Gospel is obliterated, "sign" being John's favourite term for Christ's divine deeds, which are never called by him in themselves works of power or of wonder. In the places of the three Gospels where

¹ *τέρας, δύναμις, σημεῖον.*

the word has its ordinary meaning, it is uniformly rendered "sign," and it should have been kept throughout. It is given in John xx, 30, as "signs"—"many other signs truly did Jesus," and the question may be asked, What and where are the "other signs," for they get no such name in the previous chapters. The point of many a passage is thereby lost. The mistranslation or variation was introduced on purpose, for four times the rendering is "sign" when the reference is to miracles in John; and it is also rendered "wonders" three times in Revelation, and the rendering introduces confusion. In the other books it is rendered capriciously, in Matthew and Mark it is only "sign," in Luke "sign" ten times, "miracle" once, in Acts "sign" seven times, "miracle" five times; in the Epistles, "sign" eight times, and "token" once in 2 Thess. iii, 17.¹

It is all but impossible to represent an anakolouthon in a version, or any of the paronomasia, such as are met with in Matt. xxi, 41; Luke xxi, 11; Acts viii, 30; xvii, 25; Rom. xii, 3; 1 Cor. vii, 31; xii, 2; 2 Cor. i, 13; iii, 2; v, 8; x, 12; xii, 4; 2 Thess. i, 6; iii, 11; Eph. v, 15; Heb. v, 8; or such related terms as are found in Matt. xvi, 18; and 1 Tim. i, 8. In a few cases there is some imitation of the assonance of the original. The fulness of sense usually evaporates, when a verb governs a cognate word. Compare Luke ii, 8; Eph. iv, 8; Col. ii, 19; 1 Tim. vi, 12; 1 Peter iii, 14; Rev. xvii, 6. But the connection between the symbol and the gift is not and cannot be kept in John xx, 22, "he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Spirit (Breath)." Nor can a like connec-

¹ It would scarcely be possible to give a distinct meaning to *ἐξουσία* and *δύναμις*; though "authority" is the sense of the first, and "power" of the second; the first is often rendered "power," but the second never "authority." Two allied adjectives are distinguished—one, *σάρκινος*, which occurs only once, being rendered "fleshy," 2 Cor. iii, 3, while *σαρκικός* is often translated "carnal," and twice "fleshly." But

παράκλητος is neither "comforter" nor "advocate" in the modern sense of those words, and there is no single English term that covers it. "Comforter" is also an active rendering of a passive form. "A time accepted," and "the accepted time" stand for distinct but closely connected adjectives, 2 Cor. vi, 2. *Ἀρνίον*, and *ἀμνός* used four times, and always of Christ, cannot be distinguished in an English translation.

tion be marked in 2 Cor. i, 21, "He that stablisheth us with you in Christ (the Anointed) and anointed us is God." Every English reader above the intellectual level of Davus must of necessity suppose that "teach" "teaching," Matt. xxviii, 19, 20; "kept," "kept," John xvii, 12; "sounds," "sounds," 1 Cor. xiv, 7; "came" "came" in 36; "made" "made," 2 Cor. v, 21; "ministering," "minister," Heb. i, 14, represent respectively the same Greek words repeated in those verses quoted. But it is not so. And, on the other hand, Davus himself, if he were only partially awake, could not but imagine that "release" and "let go," John xix, 12, represent different Greek verbs, and that "nigh" and "near," Matt. xxiv, 32, 33, "perfect" and "thoroughly furnished," 2 Tim. iii, 17, are put down to render different words in the original. Perhaps he might say, as some have said, that though Jesus forbids the use of the ejaculation, "Thou fool," Matt. v, 22, he yet employs it himself, "O fools," Luke xxiv, 25. But the identity is only in the English version. And he must be startled to find Jesus saluting the traitor Judas as "friend," Matt. xxvi, 50, "friend" being the uniform rendering of a very different Greek term.

CHAPTER LIV.

THE translators were guided by no fixed principle in dealing with the Greek article. Yet it ever serves its own purpose in the original, and is to be rendered in all cases, save where the English idiom forbids it. The translation of it is impossible, indeed, in the case of abstract nouns and proper names, such as "wisdom," Matt. xi, 19; "sin," Romans vii, 8; "nature," 1 Cor. xi, 14; "death," xv, 21; "God," as in 1 Thess. i, 9, though the article is there significant. As the article is used by us only in some nominal epithets, as "the apostle," "the evangelist," it may be doubted whether the English ear would bear such a literal rendering as "the weeping, the gnashing of teeth," Matt. viii, 12. It might stand before the first three nouns in Matt. xxiii, 23, but not so well before the three last. So that the presence and absence of the article cannot be well, or at least uniformly, marked in English. The phrase "Holy Spirit," when used in an objective sense, as denoting the Spirit in Himself, has commonly the article in Greek, but wants it when used in a subjective sense, as referring to His gifts or influences. There are many examples. There are many irregularities: 1 Thess. v, 5, "ye are all the children of light and the children of the day," and yet neither substantive has the article; and we have in the next clause, "we are not of the night nor of darkness," both nouns being again without the article. Somewhat similarly in the publican's prayer,— "Be merciful to me a sinner," Luke xviii, 13, where the article should be translated, for the suppliant singles out himself in his profound emotion, and he knew also that he was pointed at, from his class and profession, as "the sinner." John iii, 10,

"Art thou a teacher?" "the teacher?" specializing his repute and authority. In 1 Thess. v, 8, "faith, love, salvation," as being terms familiar and definite, have no article, and, by correlation, the preceding substantives also dispense with it, though it may appear in an English version, as in Matt. i, 1. It is the same when in connection with nuncupative verbs (Matt. v, 9). The English does not need the article in some cases, as Luke xi, 7, "in bed"; Matt. xi, 29, "in heart." A singular or plural denoting a whole race or class has the article, though it is not needed in English, and English usage sometimes renders the translation of it unnecessary, as "man," Matt. iv, 4. Compare Matt. v, 13; ix, 8; John ii, 25. The indefinite as well as the definite English article may be used in a clause where an individual represents a class, though the article is employed in Greek. Our translators took full license, and used both forms, but oftenest they ignore the definite article: Matt. xiii, 3, "a sower"; John xvi, 21, "a woman"; 1 Tim. iii, 2, "a bishop"; Matt. xv, 11, "a man"; x, 16, "wise as serpents, harmless as doves"; Luke xxii, 31, "to sift you as wheat"; Ephes. v, 24, "wives"; 25, "husbands"; vi, 1, "children"; 5, "servants"; 9, "masters"; 1 Cor. vii, 34, "a wife and a virgin," where the article might have been rendered. If it was thought that in such cases the article might be omitted in English, the rule was not carried out, for we have in Luke x, 7, "the labourer"; 2 Cor. xii, 14, "the children," "the parents"; in Galatians iv, 1, "the heir." The rendering of the article, as in these instances, is very capricious. In Matt. xxvii, 60, the correct translation given is "hewn out in the rock," yet it is in Mark xv, 46, "hewn out of a rock." But they are perpetually turning their back upon themselves. Matt. xvii, 15, "he oftentimes falleth into the fire and oft into the water"; but they give the same translation in Mark ix, 22, though there he no article in the original. But this process is also reversed, for in Matt. viii, 20, we read "the foxes . . . the birds," while in Luke ix, 58 we have the article of the original excluded—"foxes . . . birds." In Mark iv, 31, 32, the article is given in one clause—"less than all the seeds," but excluded in the next clause—"greater than all herbs." It is impossible

to divine what prompted the change in two clauses so close and so parallel. It is "the wicked one" in Matt. xiii, 19; "the wicked one" in 1 John ii, 13, 14; but "that wicked one" in iii, 12, and in v, 18. In 1 Tim. vi, 12, the clause is rightly rendered "the good fight," but in 2 Tim. iv, 7, it is "a good fight," the article being suppressed. The rendering is correct, "built his house on the sand," Matt. vii, 26, but, with curious oblivion, in verses 24, 25, the contrasted phrase is rendered "on a rock." Nay, there is a change in the same verse—Matt. xii, 29, "the strong man," which is correct in the second clause, while "a strong man" occurs in the first. In Matt. ii, 13, the same phrase is wrongly rendered "the angel of the Lord," but rightly rendered in verse 19, "an angel of the Lord." Two opposite errors are found in Luke ii, 12, which should read, "this shall be the sign, ye shall find a babe," the insertion and omission of the article being both wrong in the common version. In John vii, 40, the rendering is right, "this is the prophet," but wrong in i, 21, 25, "that prophet," with a still worse marginal rendering, "a prophet," the rendering of Tyndale; the Great Bible has "that prophet," and is followed by the Bishops'; but the Genevan of 1560 has correctly "the prophet." In Col. iv, 16, we have "this epistle" in the first clause, and "the epistle" in the last clause. The phrase is rightly given "the wrath" in 1 Thess. iii, 16, but the same phrase by itself is also rendered "wrath," as in Rom. ii, 5; v, 9. The translation of the last clause of John i, 1, is correct—"and the Word was God," the Word being marked by the article as the subject; but the rule is ignored in rendering 1 Tim. vi, 5, "supposing that gain is godliness," godliness being the subject. They also fall from their steadfastness in Matt. xiii, 39, when they render "the reapers are the angels" which would mean the whole number of the angels; but here, as in other instances, the predicate wants the article, and the sense is "the reapers are angels," or belong to the angelic orders of being. They err also in 1 Tim. vi, 2, in rendering "because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefit," for the last clause, as the article shows, is the subject, "for they who are partakers of the

benefit are faithful and beloved." "The house" is given, Matt. xiii, 1, and in ix, 28, in xvii, 25, and Mark ix, 33; but it is changed in Mark vii, 24, and in Matt. x, 12, where it should be "when ye come into the house," the house selected as worthy. While the translation is uniformly, "the desert," or the "wilderness," it is remarkable that they never say "the mountain," at least on the first mention of it in connection with Jesus, though the mountain must have been as definite to the writer, and the earliest circle of readers, as "the desert." Compare Matt. v, 1, Mark iii, 13. "Boat" and "ship" in the evangelical narrative have usually the article. But the article is inserted where it ought not in Luke vi, 17, "in the plain," which is literally "on a level place."¹

Similar inconsistency is seen in the treatment of the article which occurs before the name "Christ." As Christ was not originally a proper name, but an official epithet of the long promised, long expected Deliverer, the natural translation is "the Christ"—the Anointed One. The true translation is given in Matt. xxvi, 63, where it could not well be avoided, "whether thou be the Christ," and similarly xvi, 16, "Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ," and in the high priest's question "Art thou the Christ?" Mark xiv, 61, Luke iii, 15, and in xxiii, 35. These clauses might have shown the necessity of a similar version in Matt. ii, 4, "Herod demanded where the Christ should be born," or the person that under this title was the grand object of the national hope and prayer. Compare Matt. xxiv, 23, &c.

It may be stated more formally that, by the frequent omission of the article in the English version, the sense loses some point or speciality. The following are specimens, and the clauses

¹ There are some idioms of usage which are not very easily shown in English. *ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός* is more than "the good shepherd," the element of goodness being specialized. When two consecutive nouns occur, and the second wants the article, there is unity of thought (1 Thess. ii, 12), but when the article is repeated, as in 1 Cor. iii, 8, it should be represented in English. Nor is it easy to mark the difference in such phrases as *ὁ λαὸς ὁ κόσμος*, and *ὁ κόσμος ὁ λαός*, the second form being the more emphatic.

might be rendered as given: Matt. i, 23, "behold the virgin shall conceive," the one predicted and singled out; iv, 5, "the pinnacle of the temple," a portion of the building quite familiar; "the bushel," "the candlestick," common and characteristic articles of furniture in a Jewish house—the English version being wrongly conformed to Luke viii, 16, where the Greek has no article; viii, 12, "the outer darkness"; 32, "the whole herd ran violently down the steep," or precipice well-known; x, 23, "flee into the other or next (city)"; xiii, 42, "into the furnace"; xiii, 7, "some fell on the thorns"; xiv, 13, "followed him from the cities"; xviii, 3, "and become as the little children," perhaps at the moment within view on the shore of the lake; xxi, 12, "seats of them that sold the doves," a trade that all poor sacrificers took advantage of; xxiv, 32, "learn the parable from the fig tree," the parable given in the rest of the verse; xxv, 32, "as the shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats."

Mark ii, 16, "with the publicans and sinners" which are referred to in verse 15; iv, 38, "he was in the hinder part of the ship asleep on the pillow," the well-known pillow or cushion.

Luke ii, 7, "in the manger," which belonged to all such "inns"; vii, 5, "the synagogue," one familiar and well known; xii, 54, "the cloud" rising out of the Levant which brings rain; xvii, 17, "were not the ten cleansed," the entire company.

John iv, 40, "He abode there two days," but, 43, "now after the two days," the days just referred to; v, 35, "the burning and shining lamp," or the lamp that burneth and shineth; xiii, 5, "poureth water into the basin," the basin there, and ready to be used; 26, "to whom I shall give the sop"; xviii, 3, "Judas having received the band of men and officers," the band ordered out for him; xxi, 8, "and came in the boat," in which they had been fishing all the night.

Acts i, 13, "into the upper room"; ix, 7, "hearing the voice"; xvii, 1, "where was the synagogue of the Jews," the synagogue serving for that region, there being none at Philippi; xx, 9, "there sat in the window"; verse 13, "we went before to the ship"; xxi, 26, "until that the offering should be offered for every one of them," the offering prescribed in connection

with the termination of a vow; xxii, 25, "as they bound him with the thongs," thongs usually employed to tie up a man who was to be scourged; xxiv, 23, "he commanded the centurion to keep him," perhaps the one on duty, or by whom he had been escorted to Cæsarea.

Romans, v, 19, "the many," several times; xvi, 23, "Quartus the brother," signalized as such, or known as such, to the church of Rome.

1 Corinthians v, 9, "I write you in the epistle," probably a former one; xiv, 16, "the Amen."

2 Cor. xii, 18, "with him (Titus) I sent the brother," one well known at the time in Corinth.

Galatians, ii, 4, "the false brethren"; iv, 27, "than she which hath the husband."

Ephesians vi, 9, "forbearing the threatening," which is so notorious a characteristic of slave-masters; vi, 21, "Tychicus the beloved brother," and similarly Col. iv, 7.

Philippians iv, 17, "not that I seek the gift."

2 Thessalonians, i, 8, "taking vengeance on them that know not God, and on them that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," two classes being probably pointed at, Pagans and Jews; but the omission of the article in the second clause would identify them; ii, 3, "except there come the falling away first;" 11, "that they should believe the lie."

1 Timothy ii, 8, "I will that the men pray," the women being referred to in the following verse.

Hebrews ix, 11, "by the greater and more perfect tabernacle"; xi, 35, "not even accepting the deliverance," one so well known in Hebrew story.

1 John ii, 22, "Who is the liar?"

Revelation, ii, 10, "the crown of life"; vii, 13, "in the white robes"; 14, "out of the great tribulation," the article being repeated; xi, 11, "after the three days and a half," referred to in verse 9; xi, 12, "in the cloud"; xiv, 1, "the lamb"; xix, 16, "the name written"; 20, "into the lake." When the article is found after a preposition or before a noun, governing a following genitive, it claims special attention. "Heaven," "heavens," appear oftenest without the article,

though it is sometimes used, the singular form being specially found in Mark, Luke, and John, and the plural in Matthew.

But the English version inserts the definite article where the Greek has nothing to correspond, the rendering or omission of the article being quite irregular. Sometimes indeed the following genitive so specifies the governing noun that it has the force of an article as in 1 Thess. v, 2, "the day of the Lord," both nouns without the article—the best reading. On a different ground, Col. iv, 11, "who are of the circumcision." Gal. ii, 12, "fearing them of the circumcision," there being no article in the original with the abstract noun. 1 Cor. v, 8, "nor with the leaven of malice"; but in xii, 8, it should be "a word of wisdom," "a word of knowledge"; 2 Cor. ii, 16, "a savour of death"; iii, 15, "a veil lieth on their hearts"; xi, 13, "apostles of Christ," and similarly 2 Thess. ii, 6. Gal. i, 10, a "servant of Christ"; ii, 17, "a minister of sin"; iii, 10, "under curse." Ephes. ii, 3, "children of wrath"; v, 23, "a husband is head of the wife." Philip. ii, 15, "children of God"; 1 Tim. ii, 7, "I speak truth"; Jude i, "Jude, a servant of," but in Rev. xiii, 1, we have "the name of blasphemy," with "names" on the margin according to another reading;¹ xiv, 4, "first fruits unto God."

The following are literal renderings, though not employed in the Authorized Version: Matt. xxvi, 74, "immediately a cock crew," one of the cocks in the neighbourhood; xxvii, 4, "have betrayed innocent blood." Mark xii, 32, "thou hast spoken truth." Luke iii, 14, "and soldiers asked him, saying"; vi, 16, "who also became a traitor." John iv, 23, "an hour cometh"; 27, "wondered that he talked with a woman"—they knew nothing of her character; vi, 59, "in a synagogue." Acts i, 7, "times and seasons"; iii, 21 "heaven"; ix, 7, "hearing indeed a voice"; xvii, 23, "to an unknown God"; xxii, 4, "unto death"; xxvi, 2, "accused by Jews," not by the Jews or the whole nation. Rom. ii, 14, "Gentiles which have not the law," not the Gentiles as a class, but some of them. 1 Cor. iii,

¹ The singular is the reading of and the plural is accepted by Tre-Beza and of Stephens, though the gelles and Tischendorf, but refused latter has the plural in his margin, by Alford.

10, "I have laid a foundation"; iv, 1, "a minister of Christ." 2 Cor. vi, 16, "the temple of a living God." Gal. iv, 32, "children of a bondwoman." Philip. iii, 5, "a Hebrew of Hebrews." 1 Thess. iv, 17, "in clouds." Rev. xxii, 5, "they have not need of light of lamp and light of sun."

The presence or absence of the article with the term "law" is to be carefully distinguished, but the reader of our Bible has no clue to such distinction as is in the original.

Not only is the article omitted and inserted against rule, but it is also sometimes overpressed when rendered as a demonstrative pronoun: Matt. xv, 12, "after they heard this saying"; xxvii, 15, "at that feast," "that" in italics, and similarly Mark xv, 6. John i, 21, "Art thou that prophet?" but rightly in vii, 40, "the prophet"; iv, 37, "is that saying true"; vi, 32, "that bread"; 69, "that Christ"; vii, 26, "the very Christ"; 37, "that great day"; ix, 22, "very Christ"; xi, 51, 52, "that Jesus should die for that nation, and not for that nation only." Acts xix, 9, "but spake evil of that way." 1 Cor. v, 13, "put away that wicked person"; x, 4, "that rock was Christ"; xv, 37, "thou sowest not that body that shall be." 2 Cor. iii, 17, "now the Lord is that spirit"; vii, 11, "in this matter"; v, 27, "this epistle." 2 Thess. ii, 3, "that man of sin"; 8, "that wicked"; iii, 14, "by this epistle." Rev. i, 3, "the words of this prophecy." 1 John i, 2, "that eternal life."

1 Cor. xi, 28, "that bread," "that cup," "that" not being in italics in the first edition.

The article, however, may be sometimes translated as an unemphatic possessive pronoun: Matt. xiv, 19, "to his disciples"; xxi, 41, "let out his vineyard"; xxv, 32, "as a shepherd divideth his sheep," but "his goats" ought to have followed.

John xiii, 14, "your Lord and master."

Rev. xx, 4, "had not received his mark."

In two verses, 2 Tim. iv, 7, 8, is exhibited the following variety of translations: (1) Omission—"I have fought a good fight"; (2) Overpressure—"I have finished my course"; (3) Correct rendering—"I have kept the faith"; (4) Omission again—"A crown of righteousness."

CHAPTER LV.

THE Greek tenses are often confounded and misrendered in the English Version. While the aorist or indefinite past tense should have its own proper translation, wherever English idiom can bear it, sometimes it is rendered by the perfect; Matt. vii, 22, should be, "did we not prophesy?" at a time gone past; in Luke xiv, 18, 19, 20, are three verbs which might indeed be rendered as aorists, "I bought a piece of ground," &c., but the translation may be pardoned, "I have bought a piece of ground," &c., since the transactions are recent, and they are spoken of in immediate relation to the present act of refusal. Matt. xiii, 24; xviii, 23, "the kingdom was likened to"; or, in the view of the evangelist, the likening took place at that time—past to him, and past also to an oral narrator. In the intercessory prayer in John xvii, there are many aorists, and the meaning is apparent and impressive, for He speaks as from a high and mysterious future point, "I am no more in the world"; "I glorified thee," the past time, in an absolute sense, filling the Saviour's soul; "I manifested thy name"; "as thou didst send me"; "thou gavest him power over all flesh," a past or eternal gift of the Father to Him. Acts i, 1, "The former treatise I made," not "have I made," a statement independent of the present; 7, "which the Father put in his own power," not "hath put," the reference being to the unlimited past, the eternal act or purpose; in xix, 2, the sense and reference of the question are darkened in our version, "have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" the true translation, "did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed, or on your

believing?" and the reply is, "we did not hear whether there be Holy Ghost," for they had been baptized unto John's baptism. Similarly, in Matt. ii, 15, the reference being to a historic fact asserted by Hosea. The perfect in our version often represents the aorist to the detriment of the sense. Thus Matt. xxvii, 46, should be, "why didst thou forsake me?" Again and again in Galatians—as i, 13, "ye have heard"; ii, 16, "we have believed"; iii, 4, "have ye suffered"; 13, "hath redeemed us"; 22, "hath concluded"; 27 "have been baptized"; iv, 12, "ye have not injured me"; v, 1, "hath made free"; 13, "ye have been called"; 21, "as I have also told you"; 24, "have crucified." In these cases the English perfect mistranslates the Greek, for the verbs in the indefinite past, describe acts done long ago, or tell what was distinct in their life and experience. In iii, 13, "Christ redeemed us" is the proper rendering, "redeemed us when he died on the cross"; but the epistolary aorist in vi, 11, could not be rendered otherwise than by the perfect, "I have written."

In the epistle to the Ephesians the following places exhibit the same mistranslation of the aorist: i, 3, "hath blessed us"; 4, "hath chosen us"; 6, "hath made us accepted"; 8, "hath abounded toward us"; 9, "hath purposed"; 11, "have obtained an inheritance," all belonging to a previous period, not formally connected with the present. But the perfect is forgotten in verse 12, as if it had been an aorist, and the rendering should be, "first have hoped in Christ." The next paragraph, 20, 22, contains a series of aorists, "he wrought in Christ," "set him at his own right hand"; 22, "put all things under him"; but in the last instance there is an unaccountable deviation from uniformity, and the aorist is rendered by the perfect, "hath put all things under him." In the second chapter our version has, "hath he quickened," and in 5, "hath quickened," "hath raised us and made us to sit." The reference of the aorist is quite lost by such a rendering in the perfect, for the aorist refers back to the resurrection of Christ, when all His were included in Him, so that what is historically true of Him is spiritually and potentially true of them. Erroneous rendering is found in Ephes. ii, 14—it should be, "who made both

one," at the period of His atoning death. Again, in iv, 7, "is given" stands for "was given," at the Ascension; in 20 it ought to be, "did not so learn Christ," that is, at the time of the apostles preaching to them; and, in harmony, the next verse should be, "if so be that ye heard and were taught"; in 30, "are sealed" should be "were sealed," at the time of their conversion. In v, 2, the same blunder occurs, "as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us." The Authorized Version in this mistranslation followed the Bishops', and left the old versions, which accurately represent the aorist. In Hebrews x, 20, it is not, "he hath consecrated," but simply "consecrated," that is, at the epoch of His propitiatory death. It shows a strange carelessness to render one act of a series by the English perfect, as in Gal. iii, 2, 4, "Received ye the Spirit"; and to follow it up by a perfect, "have ye suffered"; or when the same phrase, which is rendered in Matt. xi, 21, "the mighty works which were done," is rendered in 23, "the mighty works which have been done." When the aorist is employed to present a general truth, it is impossible to give it always in idiomatic English. John xv, 6, is literally, "he was cast forth as a branch and was withered, and they cast it into the fire and they are burned." The Saviour looks back, as it were, from the period of the judgment and describes historically, but as in present view, the result of apostasy. James i, 11, presents a figure based on common experience, and it is told as if after the event by an onlooker; "for the sun rose with the heat, and dried up the grass, and the flower thereof fell away, and the beauty of its appearance perished: so also shall the rich man wither in his ways." The Bishops' gives the literal rendering.

The perfect is often correctly rendered, as in John xx, 29; Acts xxi, 28; and in 1 John v, 9; but there is no little caprice in the varying translations.

While the aorist is sometimes and necessarily rendered by the perfect, the Greek perfect is sometimes translated by the English present when a present state is specially described. It may be rendered by "is," as well as "has," in John iii, 18, "is" or "has been condemned"; John vii, 8, "my time is not

yet," or has not yet fully "come," "is" being used with this verb in our version; or 1 John iv, 12, "his love is perfected," or "has been perfected in us"; Heb. v, 12, "are become" or "have become." Rom. iv, 14, "faith is" or "has been made void." Matt. xxv, 6, "a cry is raised,"—the Greek perfect puts it in a graphic form. Compare John vii, 52. Matt. viii, 6, "my servant lieth," has been laid up; Matt. x, 30, "the hairs of your head are numbered"; also Rom. xiv, 23, "is condemned," he is under a sentence pronounced upon him in the moment of his eating, and he lies under it still. But the true translation is not to be departed from lightly. The better reading in Matt. vi, 12, warrants the translation, "as we have forgiven our debtors." Luke xiii, 2, "sinners above all sinners," because they have suffered such things. In Mark xi, 2, the translation ought to be, "whereon no man hath yet sat," past and present connected. Luke xi, 7, "the door has been shut" for the night. The proper rendering should have been kept in John iv, 38, "whereon ye have bestowed no labour." How vivid in John v, 33, when the perfect is not treated as an aorist, "ye have sent unto John, and he has borne witness unto the truth," the proper rendering being given in 37, but weakened by treating the initial aorist as a perfect. John v, 45, "Moses in whom ye have hoped." Compare 2 Cor. i, 10; 1 Tim. vi, 17. John viii, 33, "We have never been in bondage to any man"; vii, 19, "Hath not Moses given you the law?" and 22, "Moses hath given you circumcision"; Heb. xi, 3, "things which are seen have not been made of things which do appear"; 5, "before his translation it hath been witnessed of him," namely, in Gen. v, 22; 1 Cor. vii, 10, "unto them who have been married"; 1 John iv, 9, "because God hath sent his only begotten Son"; 2 Peter ii, 6, "having turned," not turning, "unto ashes the cities . . . having made them an ensample." 2 Tim. iv, 8, "all them who have loved his appearing," that is, loved, and still love it; John xi, 27, "I have believed that thou art the Christ," from a past time to the present; xvii, 6, 10, "I have been glorified in them," the glorification existing before the present, and reaching down to it. It is to be noted in v, 8,

that while the perfect is ignored in the latter part of the first clause, and rendered as if it had been an aorist, "which thou gavest me," the aorist is ignored in the next clause, and rendered as if a perfect, "and have known surely." Gal. ii, 20, "I have been crucified with Christ"; iii, 17, "a covenant which hath been confirmed by God." The perfect participle cannot well be translated as such in Heb. v, 14, the meaning being that their organs of sense have been well exercised, and still retain the acuteness or susceptibility resulting from such training.

While the participle is almost necessarily rendered as a pluperfect in John xii, 1, "who had been dead,"¹ the pluperfect meaning is lost in Luke xvi, 20, "a beggar who had been laid at his gate"—with the purpose of getting some crumbs. The aorist might bear to be rendered by the pluperfect when the occurrence is viewed as a past event, which has at the same time a reference to another past event. Acts i, 2, the Greek is literally "the apostles whom he chose"—but English idiom might prefer "whom he had chosen"—the choice being prior to the charge and connected with it. Philip. iii, 12, the aorist is rendered by the pluperfect, "not as though I had already attained," and the perfect coming after is not formally translated. The pluperfect translation is unneeded in Matt. xi, 1, 2, or if it is necessary in the first verse, it is not required in the second; nor is it required in Matt. xxv, 16, 17, 18, 20, in which places the simple past is sufficient and correct, but the rendering is pluperfect in the Authorized Version, so that the distinction is lost between it and the perfect in verse 24, "he that has received the one talent" got it and still had it unused and alone. The pluperfect occurs in Acts iv, 22, and should have been fully translated, "on whom this miracle had been done." Nor is it properly rendered in Luke xi, 22, where it should be "armour wherein he had trusted." In Heb. xi, 28, the perfect occurs in the midst of a succession of aorists, and has its own meaning, "by faith Moses refused . . . left Egypt . . . went through the Red Sea" . . . but "kept the passover" is in

¹ But ὁ τεθνηκώς is not genuine, being one of the explanatory clauses so often thrown in by scribes.

the perfect tense—that is, he founded an ordinance which still endures. The perfect participle is used of Christ's violent death as if to assert its enduring effects, as in 1 Cor. i, 23, "we preach Christ crucified" in the abiding character of the Crucified; Gal. iii, 1, where the position of the word might help the true rendering, and sense. Compare 2 Tim. ii, 8. In two passages resembling one another the aorist and perfect occur and the distinction is effaced: John i, 3, which should be "without him was not anything made which hath been made"; Col. i, 16, which should be, "by him were all things created . . . all things have been created by him and for him." Rev. v, 7, "came and took the book," literally "has taken and holds it while its seals are broken." But the perfect is ever instructive: Luke xiv, 10, "he that bade thee," should be, "he hath bidden thee." Similarly are perfects used in Heb. ii, 9; iv, 15. In fact this epistle is characterized by the use of perfects; and such a frequent use of them on the part of the author would seem to indicate that they may not be at all times employed in their distinctive significance, and they cannot be always represented in English. Heb. vii, 6, "he paid," has paid to Abraham, and "has blessed" him that had the promises, acts of enduring prerogative; 14, "has" or "is sprung out of Judah"; 22, "is Jesus made" or "has been made"; ix, 13, "sprinkling such as have become unclean." The perfect is rendered inconsistently in vii, 13, in one clause by a present, and in the other by the simple past, and similarly in the following verse. In xii, 27, the rendering might be, "things that are shaken as of things that have been made." There is no small loss to the English reader in the obliteration of the perfect in John i, 32, where the rendering should be, "I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove," and in 33, "I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God." The perfect participle preceded by the article occurs in Acts iv, 12, and in 14; but the translation varies—in the one case the rendering is "is given," in the other "was healed," none of them quite exact.

The imperfect tense, as its name denotes, represents an action begun and not completed, or one purposed, desired,

menaced, but not accomplished, an action repeated from time to time, with other shades of past relation.¹ But it cannot in every case be distinctly given in an English translation; and in the Authorized Version it is rendered and misrendered in various ways. On such points the MSS. differ often, and, as may be expected, aorists and imperfects often present various readings. It depends on the writer's choice which tense to employ—whether he means to describe the act as transient or as continuing. Some verbs too usually occur in the imperfect when an aorist would be expected. Such imperfects cannot well be fully rendered in English, as those in 1 Cor. xiii, 11, "when I was a child I spake as a child," that is, during all that period; Matt. xiii, 34, "without a parable spake he not unto them"; parabolic teaching being his wont from that period onward. The imperfect might be sometimes given by help of the auxiliary verb instead of the simple past: Luke xiv, 7, "he marked how they were choosing out the chief rooms"; xxiv, 32, "did not our heart burn within us while he was talking by the way"; Acts viii, 36, "as they were going on their way, they came unto a certain water"; Acts x, 17, "while Peter was doubting in himself"; Acts iii, 1, "Now Peter and John were going up into the temple." In some other cases a circumlocution might be pardoned, as Matt. iii, 14, "John would have hindered him;" Luke i, 59, the meaning is not "they called him Zacharias"—which is not fact, for they were interrupted—but "they were for calling him Zacharias"; Luke v, 6, "they inclosed a great multitude of fishes and the net brake," rather, the "net was like to break"; Mark xiv, 12, "were wont to kill the passover"; Luke iv, 42, "would have stayed him"; Matt. xxi, 9, "were crying Hosanna," that is, "kept crying it," John xii, 13; Mark xv, 6, the right rendering is not "at that feast he released unto them one prisoner," but "at that feast he was wont to release one prisoner."

When the imperfect and aorist occur together, our version sometimes fails to distinguish them: 1 Cor. x, 4, "they did all

¹ Driver's *Hebrew Tenses*, p. 78, Oxford, 1874—a book of remarkable acuteness and clearness.

drink of the same spiritual drink"—a mere historical reference; but the apostle adds, in proof and explanation, "for they were drinking (during the journey) out of the spiritual rock which followed them"; Luke viii, 23, "there came down a storm upon the lake and they were filled," rather, "were filling, and were (or began to be) in jeopardy"; James ii, 22, "Seest thou how faith was working with his works, and by his works his faith was perfected,"—a process presented to the reader's eye by the first verb. The English version of Matt. xxi, 8, might distinguish the act of the first clause told by the aorist, "spread their garments," from the acts of the two next clauses told by imperfects, "others were cutting down branches from the trees and were strewing them in the way"; John iv, 30, should be, "went out of the city, and were coming unto him"; vii, 14, "Jesus went up . . . and was teaching."

No attempt is made in many cases to distinguish imperfects, even in cases where the sense requires it, where English idiom allows it to be easily done, and where the context distinctly contradicts the aorist translation. But to make the distinction without a paraphrase is often difficult, if not impossible, however clear the sense may be. Thus, Heb. xi, 17, "by faith Abraham, when tried, hath offered up Isaac," the perfect marks the patriarch's settled purpose, his faith viewed the act as over; but the imperfect occurs in the next clause, and means "and he that received the promises was offering up his only begotten," when the angel of the Lord intercepted the stroke. The imperfect is rightly rendered in Rom. ix, 23; Acts vii, 26, though the idiom is peculiar.

No one can doubt that the Greek present should be preserved in our English translation wherever it is possible, even in cases where it occurs as the result of the mingling of the *oratio recta* with the *oratio obliqua*. The present gives often a vivid and picturesque character to the style, and is especially natural when the narrator "testifies what he has seen." Matt. xxi, 13, according to the better reading, "but ye make," or "are making it," "a den of robbers"—that is, doing so at the moment. But it often fades out in the Authorized

Version, Matt. xxv, 8, "our lamps are gone out," with the true rendering in the margin, "are going out." In the third chapter of Matthew we have the common inconsistency, giving the wrong translation in iii, 1, "In those days came John the Baptist," and the right one of the same phrase in verse 13, "then cometh Jesus from Galilee"; Gal. iv, 10, "ye are observing days"; Heb. xi, 13, "confessed that they are strangers"; Mark viii, 23, "asked him if he seeth any thing," or asked him "seest thou aught?" Luke xix, 3, "and was seeking to see Jesus who he is, and could not," rendered in our version, "who he was"; yet in John i, 19, we have "sent . . . to ask him, Who art thou?" Mark v, 14, "went out to see what it is that has taken place," not, perhaps, good English, nor would "are casting," in Mark xii, 41; John iv, 1, "the Pharisees heard that Jesus is making and baptizing more disciples than John," the form of the rumour as it passed from one person to another; xv, 47, "beheld where he is laid"; John v, 13, "wist not who it is"; 15, "told the Jews that it is Jesus who made him whole"; vi, 24, "Jesus is not there"; 64, "who they are that believed not," and "who he is that shall betray." Such literalness might not be tolerated, but the usage is frequent in the New Testament. 1 Cor. xi, 30, might be, not "and many sleep," but "many are falling asleep," the divine judgment was still inflicting itself; John i, 15, "John bears witness of him, and has cried, saying,"—"bare witness" in the Authorized Version; while the proper rendering is given in 29, 43, 45, &c.; Heb. ii, 16, "he taketh not on him the nature of angels," or, "for in truth it is not angels that he helpeth"; Rev. xii, 2, "she being in pain crieth."

The frequent use of the present tense characterizes the Gospel of Mark, and it is also found again and again in the Epistle to the Hebrews. There are many perfects in Heb. vii, and quite in harmony there are not a few presents. The present is used in the eighth chapter to portray sacerdotal service as if it still existed, 3, "is ordained," "priests that offer," "who are serving." In chapter ix, 6, the present is employed, but it is given in our version in the past, "the

priests went always in," and went is repeated in italics in the next verse. The present is rendered, "which he offered"; a double error is carried into verse 9, "in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not make perfect." The writer pictures "the time then present"—the service, as if it were going on—priests as if in the act of entering in and offering.

When the present indicates something to be found true in time to come, there is no reason to give it a future rendering, as is done in Matt. xvii, 11, "Elias truly shall first come," but, "Elijah truly cometh, and he shall restore all things." The rendering is wrong in Matt. xxiv, 40, 41, "one shall be taken"; but "one is taken, one is left"; the future is used in Luke xvii, 34. In John xvi, 14, 15, there is confusion in the rendering—in the first verse it is right, "he shall take of the things that are mine"; but in the second verse it is wrong, for the present is used, "therefore said I, that he taketh of mine, and shall show it unto you." Similarly, John vii, 41, "Doth the Christ come out of Galilee?" John xv, 27, "and ye also bear," not "shall bear witness." So in Matt. xxvii, 63, the true rendering is the more vivid, "after three days I rise again," or "I am raised again." John xxi, 23, "that disciple does not die"; and in Gal. iii, 8, "the Scripture foreseeing that God justifies the heathen," the ethical present, a fact true, and always true of the divine method of justification. It might be difficult to translate the present participle as describing Judas while his treachery was going on, and to distinguish it from the aorist as applied to him in the earlier part of the Gospels. The present is, however, rendered in Matt. xxvi, 46, as "he that betrayed him"; and in xxvii, 3, "which had betrayed him"; but in verses 25 and 48, "which betrayed him." In Mark xiv, 42, the rendering is of necessity correct, "he that betrayeth me"; but in 44 it relapses into the past; is correct again in Luke xxii, 21, 22; but stands in John xiii, 11, "who should betray him," the past being given in xviii, 2, 5; but the present again in John xxi, 20, "Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee?"

Our translators sometimes take the future as an imperative

when there is no cause for it: Matt. v, 48, "ye shall therefore be perfect"; and sometimes for a wish, as 2 John 3, when the true rendering is found in the margin, "Grace shall be with you." The proper rendering in 1 Tim. vi, 8, is not imperative, "but if, having food and raiment, we will be content therewith," as indeed might be expected of us believers who are laying hold of eternal life.

Some moods of the present cannot always be distinguished in translation from those of the aorist. Thus in the Lord's Prayer, Matt. vi, 11, the aorist imperative is used, "give us this day"; but in Luke xi, 3, the present imperative occurs. In 1 John iii, 9, the words are, "he cannot sin," or, literally, "he is not able to sin," the infinitive present being employed, and the sense being that he is not able to be sinning, or to persist in a sinful course; but the aorist infinitive might have meant that he is not able to sin in a single instance. The aorist subjunctive is used in 1 John ii, 1, and the proper translation is not "if any man sin," but "if any man have sinned."

Many peculiarities in the use of verbal words, and of the middle voice, cannot be glanced at.

The two Greek verbs which differ, as "become," and "be," are often confounded in the English version. The first verb seems to have nearly always its proper meaning, though in every case English idiom will not bear its translation. Thus, in Matt. viii, 26—it cannot well be said, "there became a great calm," that is, a great calm ensued; and yet in 24, we have the good rendering, "there arose a great tempest"; John i, 6, might be, "there arose a man." In Matt. xv, 28, we cannot well say, "become it unto thee," though a change is implied. In Matt. xiv, 15, the rendering is, "when it was evening"; and in 23, there is the better rendering, "when the evening was come." In 1 Cor. iii, 18, "become" is given in the first clause, and, for no visible reason, "be" is given in the second. The verb is rendered "came to pass," or "come to pass" over forty times in Luke; it is also rendered "made" or "done," "fulfilled," "arose," "arise," "came," "performed," "brought to pass," "turned into," and all these are better than the simple verb of existence so often

employed. Once it is wrongly rendered "seemeth," "seemeth good," Matt. xi, 26; once the past participle is also wrongly rendered "ended," John xiii, 2; once the rendering is "continued," Acts xix, 10; once "behaved ourselves," 1 Thess. ii, 10; once "which was published," Acts x, 37, and once "being assembled," Acts, xv, 25. The translation in such places was dictated by the sense. Our translators have employed the right rendering, so truly and happily, in so many cases, that the wonder is that they did not make an effort to carry it out consistently. In fact, in many clauses, if we add the syllable "come" or "came" to their "be," we have the correct translation. There are very many examples, and only a few can be given: Matt. v, 45, "that ye may be-come the children of your father"; Matt. xvii, 2, "his garment be-came white as the light"; Mark x, 43, "whosoever will be-come great among you," and similarly in iii, 44; Luke vi, 36, "be-come ye therefore merciful"; xx, 14, "that the inheritance may be-come ours"; John iv, 14, "shall be-come in him a well of water"; ix, 27, "will ye also be-come his disciples"; Acts i, 20, "let his habitation be-come desolate"; Rom. xii, 16, "be-come not wise in your own conceits"; 1 Cor. iii, 18, "let him become a fool that he may be-come wise"; x, 7, "neither be-come ye idolaters"; Galat. iv, 12, "be-come as I am"; Philip. ii, 15, "that ye may be-come blameless"; Heb. ii, 17, "that ye might be-come a merciful and faithful high priest"; 1 Peter, i, 15, "be-come ye holy," and 16; 2 Peter i, 4, "that by these ye might be-come partakers of a divine nature." Other instances might be adduced: Matt. xii, 45, "the last state of that man becometh worse"; Luke vi, 16, "Judas Iscariot," not "which was also the traitor," but "who became or turned out to be a traitor"; Acts iv, 4, "and the number of the men became (or rose to) about five thousand," the three thousand of Pentecost being included; Acts xv, 39, "the contention became so sharp"; Rom. xi, 6, "otherwise grace becomes no more grace"; Gal. iii, 24, "the law is become our schoolmaster unto Christ."

The rendering "become" or "became" suits in some cases better than "was made." John 1, 14, "the Word became

flesh"; viii, 33, "ye shall become free." Ephes. iii, 7, "whereof I became a minister." This correct translation is given in many places, as James ii, 4, "are become judges of evil thoughts"; 11, "thou art become a transgressor"; but in the intermediate verse the wrong rendering occurs, "he is" for "becomes guilty of all." In 1 Cor. vii, 21, the rendering is, "if thou mayest be made free"; and that of 23 should have been in harmony, "be ye not made the servants of men"; better in both cases, "if thou mayest become free," "become not ye the servants of men." The passive form, which rarely occurs, is found not less than eight times in the first and second chapters of 1st Thessalonians.

CHAPTER LVI.

THE technical name "preposition" tells nothing of the nature and uses of such particles. They may not be employed in the New Testament with all the precision of the age of Pericles, yet their distinctive signification is ever to be closely attended to. The phase of relation indicated by those which have a general similarity of sense cannot be always preserved in an English translation.¹ These meanings are often shaded off the one into the other; it is but a delicate line that divides them. English prepositions have also in the same way a variety of uses closely connected with one another. Still a true translation of these important particles is of primary moment. The Authorized Version is faithful on the whole, but it has, as usual, startling deviations, and several inaccuracies.

No one will maintain that the first of these² should be always rendered by "in," since, with a local sense, it may be rendered "at" as well as "in"; "in Bethany," or "at Ephesus," "in" or "at Jerusalem," and in a temporal sense by "at" or "on," "at his coming." After words implying an oath, it is rendered "by," "by heaven," and so when it has an instrumental or modal sense, "by what authority?" or "with what measure." It is translated "among," referring to a crowd or mass of people, and "within," as in the phrase "within yourselves." English idiom may require some of these changes, though the radical idea always underlies them, so that the literal rendering

¹ As ἐκ and ἀπό—περί and ὑπέρ—μετά and σύν—εἰς and πρὸς with the accusative.

² ἐν.

might be kept in many places, as in Rom. xii, 8, "he that giveth, let him give in simplicity, he that ruleth in diligence, he that showeth mercy in cheerfulness." "Through" is not the proper translation of Rom. iii, 25, but "in," "in the forbearance of God"; nor in Acts iv, 2, which should be, "and preached in Jesus the resurrection of the dead," in Jesus its proof and a living specimen of it. The utterance of Peter on healing the lame man was, "in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk"; and when the apostle was arrested and brought before the Sanhedrim, the question was put to him, "in what name did ye do this," and his answer naturally is, "in the name of Jesus Christ." Mark xiv, 27, it should be "offended in me," not "because of me," the first rendering being found in Matt. xi, 6. In Luke xi, 15-20, we have those renderings varied for no purpose—"through Beelzebub," 15, 18; "by Beelzebub," "by whom," 19; "with the finger of God," 20. In 2 Cor. vii, 4, the rendering is "with" in the one clause and "in" in the other. In 1 Cor. vi, 11, the first clause has "in" and the second "by." In 2 Cor. vi, 4, four nouns are preceded by "in," and six in 5, but in 6, 7, "by" is adopted before eight substantives, and as the Greek preposition is changed in 7, 8, and is also rightly translated "by," the distinction is obliterated to the English reader. Luke x, 17, should be "in thy name." John xvii, 17, "in thy truth"; xx, 31, "in his name." Compare also Luke xi, 19. Rom. vi, 11, "through Jesus Christ our Lord," and in 23; xv, 17, "I may glory through Jesus Christ," Gal. v, 10, "confidence in you through the Lord." Ephes. ii, 7, "his kindness toward us through Jesus Christ," &c.; iv, 32, "for Christ's sake." In those and other places, the rendering is that which rightfully belongs to another preposition, which is often employed to designate a special aspect of Christ's mediatorial work—in Him and through Him being quite distinct, but both ideas being presented in close connection in Ephes. i, 7. Similar remarks apply to the rendering "by" in Rom. xiv, 14; 1 Cor. vii, 14; Gal. ii, 17; 1 Thess. iv, 1.¹

¹ ἐν should, if possible, be so rendered that the phrase may not seem to be a simple dative.

In the Authorized Version there are also other needless variations. 1 Thess. iv, 7, "God called us not unto uncleanness, but unto holiness," the last clause being "in holiness." Similarly the proper distinction might be preserved in Matt. vi, 10; in xxviii, 18, and should be "in heaven and on earth"; and also Rev. v, 3. This preposition is also used in the succession of clauses in 2 Peter i, 5-7, and was properly rendered by Tyndale. The use of "to" makes the series a mere accumulation, but "in" implies that they spring out of one another in organic development. 1 Cor. vii, 15, "but God hath called us to peace," "in peace" being placed in the margin as the true representative of the Greek. In 1 Cor. xiv, 11, the meaning is lost, "I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian," the simple dative being employed, but in the next clause, which is rendered similarly, the preposition is used, "and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me," in my opinion or experience. The misrendering of the prayer of the penitent robber in Luke xxiii, 42, is more serious, the true translation being "Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom,"—in the full enjoyment of thy power and prerogative. Compare Matt. xxvi, 31.

The various meanings of another preposition¹—literal and tropical, instrumental, local, temporal, and ideal, are closely connected. But there is, as has been often noted, a marked distinction in sense or relation between it as followed by a genitive when it means "through," and as followed by an accusative when it means "on account of." "Through," indicating the instrument, is a rendering preferable in many cases to "by," which might denote the agent, Matt. xxvi, 24, "the things done through his body," 2 Cor. v, 10, it being the instrument. Compare specially 1 Thess. iv, 14, "Them also which sleep through Jesus." Sometimes this rendering "through" cannot well be preserved in English, as in the phrase Matt. iv, 4, "every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," where "through the mouth of God" would not be very appropriate. In 2 Tim. ii, 2, we have the inadequate rendering "the things that thou hast heard among many witnesses," the

¹ *διὰ*.

better rendering "by" being put into the margin; Heb. vii, 9, presents the rendering "Levi paid tithes in," instead of "through Abraham." The force of the preposition is lost in 2 Peter i, 3, "that hath called us to glory and virtue," the proper rendering "by" being relegated to the margin—a translation, also, that suits the instrumental dative, which is probably the correct reading. But many variations are unaccountable. Its usual sense with the accusative—"because of," "by reason of," "for. . . sake," as "Christ's sake," "your sake,"—is sometimes departed from. In Heb. ii, 9, the wrong rendering "by" is put into the margin, the text retaining "for," that is, "on account of"; but there is so little steadiness, that in vi, 7, the wrong "by" is kept in the text, and the right "for" put in the margin; and the same is done in Rom. viii, 11, "by" in the text and "because of" in the margin. In Rom. xv, 30, the rendering is such as belongs to the preposition with an accusative, "for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake," where it ought to be "by the Lord Jesus Christ and by the love of the Spirit." In 1 Cor. vii, 2, where there is exegesis, "to avoid fornication," instead of "on account of fornication"—that is, its prevalence, and the temptations to it, suggested the form of the counsel, verse 5. John xv, 3, "now ye are clean," not "through," but by "reason of" "the words which I have spoken unto you." A worse departure is made in 2 Pet. iii, 12, "the coming of the day of God wherein," and without any marginal alternative—the correct rendering being "the coming of the day of the Lord 'by reason of which' the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved." The real allusion is not presented in Rev. xii, 11, "wherein they overcame him,"—the translation might be, "they overcame him because of the blood of the lamb." The phrase "for the remission of sins," in Rom. iii, 25, should be "on account of the prætermission of sins." In Rev. xiii, 14, the Authorized Version has "by means of those miracles"—whereas it should be "because of the signs it was given him to do." It is to be noted that the words "the means of" are now printed in italics, as if to show that the original did not warrant the translation; but the italics are not in the first edition of 1611; they appear in a Cambridge

edition of 1637, and in Buck and Daniel's folio of the following year.

Uniformity of translation is kept where the particle is repeated: in Rom. xi, 28, "for your sakes," "for the fathers' sakes." On the other hand, in Rom. xiv, 15, the rendering "with thy meat," should be "for the sake of thy meat," and the more so that "with thy meat" in the next clause represents the simple dative.

The many shades of relation indicated by a third preposition¹ need not be enumerated. Only it may be noted that, in some cases, it must be rendered by "in," previous motion being implied, the same tendency being found in classic Greek: as in Matt. ii, 23; Mark ii, 1; John ix, 7; Mark i, 9; Luke xi, 7, "my children are with me in bed"; Matt. x, 9, "money in your purses"; Luke ix, 61; Luke vii, 50, "go in peace,"—into peace. Compare Mark xiii, 9. But there are several variable renderings, as when it is translated "throughout," "throughout all Syria," Matt. iv, 24; Mark i, 28, 39; or "among," Mark iv, 7, xiii, 10; or "concerning," 2 Cor. viii, 23; or "before," in James ii, 6. Perhaps "against" is too strong, though the clause implies it, Mark iii, 29; or, in Luke vii, 30, "against themselves," where the margin has "within themselves," though "against that day" is a good idiomatic version, 2 Tim. i, 12. There was no pressing reason why, in Acts i, 10, 11, it should be rendered "toward" in the one verse and "into" in the other. It occurs in the phrase rendered "swear not, neither by Jerusalem,"—that is, probably, looking toward it, or on it, and taking the oath in that attitude. It is idiomatically rendered with its substantive in Romans x, 1, "that they may be saved,"—that salvation being the aim or end of his "heart's desire,"—the phrase being rendered "unto salvation" in 1 Pet. i, 5. "Baptized into Christ" is the correct rendering in Gal. iii, 27, Rom. vi, 3, and the rendering should have been kept when

¹ εἰς. Πῶς τε ὦ may be followed by a simple dative, or by a dative with ἐν or ἐπί, or by a simple accusative, or by an accusative with

εἰς or ἐπί, and in all these forms a distinctive shade of relation is expressed.

what is equivalent to a person follows the verb, as in Matt. xxviii, 19, "baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,"—"in the name" being inadequate here, in Acts viii, 16, and in 1 Cor. x, 2, "were all baptized into Moses," it being ideal, typical, and national baptism; and, in Acts xix, 5, where the "unto," employed both in the question and answer in verse 3, might have suggested "into." The point of the Apostle's challenge is lost in 1 Cor. i, 13, 15, by the same rendering. His question is, "were ye baptized into the name of Paul? lest any should say that I had baptized into mine own name,"—"in mine own name" would simply mean "by my own authority." This preposition should have kept its proper significance in Luke xvi, 8, "wiser" not "in their own generation," but "toward" or "in the interest of their generation." 1 Pet. i, 11, "the sufferings of Christ,"—"the sufferings to come upon Christ,"—though a literal translation, would be awkward; Acts vii, 53, "who received the law," not "by," but "at" the enactment "of angels,"—the preposition bearing a similar meaning in Matt. xii, 41, "at the preaching of Jonas," and in 2 Tim. ii, 26. The translation in John xi, 52, should be "might gather together into one." Compare 2 Cor. xi, 3.

Of the two prepositions¹ rendered "out," or "from," the one refers to a previous closer union, Matt. xxii, 37, and the other is more general, Matt. xxiv, 32, "learn ye a parable from the fig tree." Care should be taken that the translation cannot be mistaken for that of a mere genitive.

Two prepositions² are often all but identical in signification. The first is mistranslated in 2 Thess. ii, 1, where our version reads "by," as if the verse were a species of adjuration by the second advent, the sense being "on behalf of." It is to be noted that this is the only place in the New Testament where the preposition is so rendered, and there is not even a marginal alternative. It is the reading, however, of all the older versions, and was used by Wycliffe for the Latin *per*. Such a rendering is possible, but out of all harmony with the construction of the passage.

¹ ἐκ and ἀπό.

² ὑπέρ and περί.

The second preposition has much the same sense with the first in some cases, and it is impossible to keep them distinct in English. To pray about a person is to pray for him, and the idiomatic rendering is "for . . . sake," for his body's sake, for Christ's sake. "About" or "concerning" would represent it better in many places—Matt. vi, 28, "and why are ye anxious concerning raiment," and in many other places.

Another preposition,¹ with the genitive, might be generally rendered "by," but, in the great majority of instances, it is rendered "of" in the Authorized Version. There is usually no ambiguity in such an archaism, as in the phrases "baptized of him," "hated of all men," "tempted of Satan"; but there are cases presenting ambiguity to a plain reader—Matt. xix, 12, "made eunuchs of men"; Luke ix, 7, 8, "and said of some."² But in many instances the favourite old rendering "of" need not be disturbed. In Acts x, 22, it is rendered "among" in the one clause, and "by" in the other. On the other hand, "of" occurs twice in Rom. xiii, 1, representing two different Greek prepositions—"there is no power but from God . . . ordained by God."

The English "on," rather than "in," is the better representative of another preposition,³ in many places, as in Matt. iv, 6, "on their hands they shall bear thee up"; xii, 28, "then is the kingdom of God come upon you"; xiii, 7, "on thorns," as in verse 5, "upon stony places," and in 8 it ought again to be "upon the good ground"; xiv, 8, 11, "upon a charger"; Matt. xxv, 31, "the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory" (as in xix, 28, "ye also shall sit upon thrones"); xxiii, 2, "sit on Moses' seat"; Mark vi, 55, "to carry about on beds." But there was no reason to vary the rendering of the particle in the same connection in Acts x, 17, and xi, 11, "before the gate" in the first instance, and "come unto the house" in the second.

Another preposition⁴ is sometimes rendered "to" as well as

¹ *ὑπό*.

² See page 242, &c., and page 365.

³ *ἐπί*.

⁴ *πρός* is almost always used with

the accusative—it is difficult to give it such a translation as shall show its difference from *ἐίς*, or the simple dative.

"unto," though "unto" might, if possible, be reserved for it in such cases. But the preposition has other senses—"with," "toward," "according to," "before,—and, as edged by the context, it passes in result to the sense of "against," the Authorized Version rendering "against," Mark xii, 12, the sense being that conveyed by the familiar phrase, "spake this parable at them."¹

¹ The conjunctions *ὅπως* and *ἵνα* the same verse, John iii, 17, translating it like an infinitive in the sometimes, especially as prefixed to first clause, and in the second clause a prayer, embodies purport as well by the fuller form "that . . . as purpose (Eph. iii, 16, &c.) But might"? why vary the rendering of *ἵνα* in

CHAPTER LVII.

THE second rule given to the revisers appointed after the Hampton Court Conference, was, "the names of the prophets and the holy writers, with the other names in the text, to be retained, as near as may be, according as they are vulgarly used."

Acting on these instructions, they were not at liberty to transcribe into English letters all the old Hebrew names, for several of them had been naturalized in other forms. As many of the names of the Old Testament are repeated in the New Testament, the remarks in this chapter must comprise allusions to the names used in the Hebrew Scriptures. The most familiar forms were wisely employed—such as Mary, Eve, Saul, James, John, Jude. To have reproduced such names in full Hebrew or Greek syllables would have been a cumbrous and pedantic literality. They employ Cyrus for Corish, Darius for Daryavesh, Egypt for Mitzraim, and, as Canon Lightfoot says, they used "the more familiar Latin names" of the idol-gods for the less familiar Greek ones, Diana for Artemis, Jupiter for Zeus, and Mercury for Hermes. In this last case, however, there was error, for the gods of the Latin name were different in function, character, and attributes from those of the Greek name. At the same time, many names had become disguised in the Greek and Latin Old Testament, such as Abdias for Obadiah, Oza for Uzzah, Roboam for Rehoboam, Ochosias for Ahaziah, and they usually appear in that shape in the early translation of Coverdale. The translators represent Jehovah by "LORD" printed in small capitals. It is all but impossible to say what is the

true pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton; but the word Jehovah is quite familiar to all readers of the English Bible, and its uniform use would prevent some confusion of reference.¹ It is employed in composition with other significant terms—like Jehovah-Nissi—Shalom; but it occurs only four times by itself, and in one of the instances its use could not be avoided—Exod. vi, 3, "by my name Jehovah was I not known to them." Ps. lxxxiii, 18, "whose name alone is Jehovah." But Moses is commanded to tell the people that the Name was Jehovah; and the full sense is lost in many phrases, which should be, Jehovah the God of Shem, Jehovah the God of Abraham. "If Jehovah be God, follow him"; "Jehovah he is the God," or in the xix Psalm, "the heavens declare the glory of Elohim, but the law of Jehovah is perfect." The solemn collocation, Isa. xii, 2, of Jah-Jehovah, becomes the "Lord-Jehovah"; and in xxvi, 4. But another form, Adonai Jehovah, is often wrongly rendered, as in Ezek. v, 11, "Lord God." The Hebrew tongue was very rich in terms expressive of religious emotion and truth.² While no one would think, in the case of James, Mary, and Jesus, of going back to the Old Testament and substituting Jacob, Miriam, and Joshua; it would in many instances serve the purpose of identification, to carry forward the spelling of the Old Testament into the New, to suppress Elias and preserve Elijah, to give Kish for Cis, Jonah for Jonas, Sharon for Saron, Elisha for Ehseus, Korah for Core, Noah for Noe, Midian for Madian, Zebulon for Zabulon, and Napthali for Nephthalim, Hosea for Osee, and Joshua for Jesus in Acts vii, 45, and Hebrews iv, 8. It is painful to read, "Sem, which was the son of Noe"; and whoever quotes Charran, or Chanaan, or Enos, or Esaias, or Jeremy, or Agar, or Sodoma, or Jephthae, though these names occur in the New Testament?

The rule, then, commends itself, to use the forms best known or to take them from the original as nearly as possible, and to

¹ The reader will find a good discussion on the pronunciation of the sacred name, by Russell Martineau, volume of his "Translation of Ewald's History of Israel." London, 1869.
M.A., in an Appendix to the second

² See pp. 386, 387.

preserve, save in a few hallowed instances, the same spelling of proper names in the New Testament as occurs in the Old. But there are many capricious exceptions found in our version. Often we find two forms of a name—as Asshur seven times, and Assyria over twenty-five, and the alteration often occurs in the same book. It is uniformly Assyria in 2 Kings, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and in the minor prophets after Hosea; while in Ezekiel both forms are given, and in Hosea Asshur is used once and Assyria four times. It is odd that the form is Tyre in all the books up to Jeremiah, and the same in Joel iii, 4, but otherwise it is Tyrus in the Old Testament. Both spellings—Zidon and Sidon, Zidonians and Sidonians—occur in the Old Testament, and we have, Gen. x, 15, “Canaan begat Sidon,” and in 1 Chron. i, 13, “Canaan begat Zidon.” Grecia occurs in Daniel only, Greece in Zechariah; Grecians is found in Joel, and in Acts meaning Hellenists, and Greeks everywhere else in the New Testament. Edom is common throughout the Old Testament, and Idumea is used four times in Isaiah and Ezekiel. Cush, the Hebrew name, occurs only in Isaiah xi, 11, and Ethiopia in all other places. Peculiar variations are found in the New Testament, not as apart from the Old Testament, but as within itself. One name is Timothy seven times, and Timotheus seventeen times; Timotheus always in the Acts, Romans, 1 Corinthians, Philippians, and Thessalonians, and Timothy always in the epistles addressed to himself; nay, both names occur in one chapter (2 Cor. i). Jeremy and Jeremias are both found in Matthew. Silas and Silvanus both represent one person, the first form of which is uniformly used in the Acts, and the second in the Epistles. Sina stands in Acts, but Sinai in Galatians. The Apollos of the Acts becomes Apollo in 1 Cor. iii, 4-6, in the edition of 1611. The familiar name, Priscilla, of the Acts, Romans, and Corinthians, becomes Prisca in 2 Tim. iv, 19, but they had this reading in their Greek text. Cretes is the form in Acts ii, 11, and Cretians in Titus i, 12. In the course of the same argument the fourth son of Jacob is both Judah and Juda, Heb. vii, 14; viii, 8; and as the last is a quotation, the Old Testament spelling has been preserved. It is Judas in

the genealogy of Matthew; but Juda in that of Luke, and Jude is the name of the Apostle.¹ The archaic term Jewry, for Judea, is still found in Luke xxiii, 5, and in John vii, 1. It represents Judah in the Old Testament, Judea occurring only once in Ezra v, 8, but Jewry also only once in Dan. v, 13, in combination with Judah, the same word being represented by both, “Art thou Daniel, which art of the children of the captivity of Judah, which the king my father brought out of Jewry?” (Judah). In a word, one name appears in many different forms—Joshua, Jehoshua, Jehoshuah, Hosea, Hoshea, Osee, Osea, Oseas, Oshea, Jeshuah, Jesus. Calvary, which occurs only in Luke xxiii, 33, is from the Calvaria of the Vulgate. Compare Matt. xxvii, 33; Mark xv, 22; John xix, 17. The name is Luke in Col. iv, 14, 2 Tim. iv, 11, and Lucas in the Epistle to Philemon, 24. It is always Mark in Acts, also in 2 Tim. iv, 11, but Marcus in Col. iv, 10, Philemon 24, 1 Peter v, 13. It is Noe five times in Matthew and Luke, but Noah three times in Hebrews and in 1 and 2 Peter. Simon, son of Jona, in John i, 42, and in the same Gospel, son of Jonas, xxi, 15; but the more probable reading for Jonas is John.

Urbane² is the name of a man (Rom. xvi, 9), for it represents Urbanus, but a final *e* was common in those days. A woman's name becomes Euodias (Philip. iv, 2), but Junia (Rom. xvi, 7), on account of the masculine epithet following, is probably to be taken as a man's name, Junias. Miletus (Acts xx, 15, 17) is Miletum in 2 Tim. iv, 20. Miletum, as Archbishop Trench has remarked, is a “singular mistake,” and is inherited from the earlier versions. But with a portion of the verse corrected, the Bishops' has, “Erastus abode at Corinthum,” and so Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Great Bible; but both the Genevan

¹ Keim, in his *Life of Jesus*, uses the form Nazara, but the Greek gives Nazareth, so familiar to us; Beliar, though found in Greek, will not supersede Belial, the old Hebrew form; Beelzeboul, is also found,

though the common form occurs in the Old Testament, 2 Kings i, 2. It would be bold to change Sychar into Shechem, John iv, 5.

² Οὐρβανός.

editions present a suggestive difference, "Erastus abode at Corinthus."

Official names, that is, names of functionaries which have no parallel in modern times, are difficult to the translator. We have, in the New Testament, tetrarch naturalized, but ethnarch (2 Cor. xi, 32) is rendered governor—the ruler of a people, as the head of the Jews in Egypt, though it is applied also to Simon Maccabæus and to the chief magistrate of the Jews living in a foreign country under their own laws. Politarchs, the name given to the magistrates of Thessalonica,¹ Acts xvii, 6, 8, is rendered "rulers of the city." Asiarch occurs in Acts xix, 31, vaguely rendered "chief of Asia"; those Asiarchs, named from their province, presided over worship and sacred festivals. Though politarch and Asiarch had no chance, why should not ethnarch have been transferred as well as tetrarch, with an explanatory marginal note, especially as tetrarch did not keep the meaning implied in its composition—the ruler of a fourth part,—for it was simply the title of a governor in a Roman province. Herod and his brother were, by an imperial grant, made tetrarchs of Judea. Herod Antipas, called tetrarch in Matt. xiv, 1, is named king in the ninth verse of the same chapter. We have also chiliarch, hekatontarch, stratopedarch, the first rendered chief captain (Acts xxi, 31), the second centurion (32), and the third (Acts xxviii, 16) was the captain of the prætorian guard, but the clause may not be genuine. The same Greek title is given to Pilate, to Felix, and to Festus, and is rendered "governor,"—they were procurators exercising power in a small province. Another term, denoting pro-consul, the governor of a senatorial province, is rendered deputy, Acts xviii, 12. But the "magistrates" of Philippi (Acts xvi, 36) belonged to a different term, for it was a Roman colony and they were duumvirs, or prætors, attended by "sergeants" or lictors. It is not easy to get characteristic names in English for those various officers, though some distinction might be preserved. The "town clerk," such as he of Ephesus (Acts xix, 35), kept the archives

¹ On a surviving arch at Thessalonica, naming the magistrates, the term occurs.

and read the decrees in the public assemblies; the "chamberlain" of the city (Rom. xvi, 23) was the treasurer, fiscal-officer, or œconomus; the receiver of rents and revenues in such cities as Edinburgh, Glasgow, and London, is still called chamberlain. Wycliffe has "tresorere," and the Rheims "cofferer."

Chaldee names are more easily transferred. Rab-mag, chief of the Magi; Rabshakeh, chief of the cup-bearers; the title of Nebu-shas-ban is Rab-saris, chief of the eunuchs—rendered "officer" in the text and "eunuch" in the margin. In Jer. xxxix, Nebuzar-adan is called "captain of the guard"—Rab-tabbachim, "chief of the executioners," as in the margin.

In a word, English plural forms are wrongly given to some Hebrew names, as cherubims, seraphims, Anakims. Ephod, phylactery, synagogue, sabbath, selah, Satan, rabbi, heresy, exorcist, remained untranslated.

CHAPTER LVIII.

SEVERAL gems, or precious stones, are also only transferred, and it is extremely difficult to distinguish or to identify them, so that the rendering is often mere conjecture.

The translators confess, with truth, in their Preface: "Again, there be many rare names of certaine birds, beastes, and precious stones, &c., concerning which the Hebrewes themselves are so diuided among themselues for iudgement, that they may seeme to haue defined this or that, rather because they would say something, then because they were sure of that which they said." The eager and confident Hugh Broughton proposed that, in the work of translation, "embroiderers should help for terms about Aaron's ephod; geometricians, carpenters, masons, about the temples of Solomon and Ezekiel; and gardeners for all the boughs and branches of Ezekiel's trees, to match the variety of the Hebrew terms."

While pilgrims have in all ages been attracted to the Holy Land, it is to be regretted that the natural history of Palestine has been so little explored by them. Travellers bent on geographical identifications paid only a passing attention to shrubs and animals. Few had acquired the requisite qualifications, and many tourists could scarcely tell a swift from a swallow, a sparrow from a finch, a gazelle from a kid, an olive from an oleander, an oak from a terebinth, or a fig from a sycamore. Bochart's "*Hieroicoicon*," the fruit of great labour and omnivorous research, abounds in erudite theories, happy fancies, and odd etymologies. Ursinus's "*Arboretum*" and Hillers's "*Hierophyticon*" are similar compilations, wonderful in learning. The "*Hierobotanicon*" of Olaus Celsius is a great

improvement, and the eight folio volumes of Scheuchzer's "*Physica Sacra*" are overwhelming in their vastness; while Hasselquist, Russell, and Forskal, are not to be forgotten. Attention may be invited to a little unpretending volume by Canon Tristram, "*The Natural History of the Bible*," London, 1868, 2nd ed. Canon Tristram himself is a distinguished naturalist, and he was accompanied on his tour by scientific investigators.

All genuine information about the country of its birth throws light upon Scripture, especially on the Old Testament in which the scenery, climate, and productions of that mountainous country are so often referred to by annalists and poets. The Land illustrates the Book, for it has stamped its own image upon it. Though it was but a small territory, yet it surpasses in renown every other region on the face of the earth—as the scene where the patriarchs wandered and Joshua gained his victories, where the Tabernacle with its Holy of holies stood, the priest instructing by Urim and Thummim, and the prophet pronouncing his oracles, where David reigned and sung, and Nebuchadnezzar inflicted such desolation, and where throughout all the centuries of its chequered existence the nation fondly clung to the hope of a promised Deliverer, where at length He appeared clothed in humanity and died on the cross, and whence has gone out an influence which is changing, elevating, and blessing the world. The country belonged to Asia, but it was on the confines of Europe and Africa. The fauna and flora of three great continents meet in it, and its summer splendour, its frosts and snows, its spring and autumn, its flocks and pastures, its vintage and harvest, supply imagery to a book designed for universal circulation. Its "dew of Hermon," "balm of Gilead," "rose of Sharon," "lily of the valley," and "swelling of Jordan," have been long naturalized among us. As its scenery ranged from dry deserts to wooded slopes, from palms to cedars, from the cliffs of Engedi to the snows of Lebanon, it was a miniature of the world, and the fitting centre from which light and hope were to radiate through all the earth. Canaan, the name so common in Scripture, was the ancient name of Phœnicia; and Palestine.

in our Old Testament, is simply what is now called Philistia.

There is not only no small uncertainty about the botany and zoology of Scripture, but the uncertainty becomes darker through the inconsistencies of the English translation. We can glance only at a very few examples. Satyr, dragon, cockatrice, and unicorn must disappear. In Isaiah xiii, 21, the version is, "and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there"; and in xxxiv, 14, "the satyr shall cry to his fellow." How could this mythological creature find its way into the English Bible, and that even without a marginal explanation? The "wild beasts of the desert," Isaiah xiii, 21, 22, has in the margin "Heb. Ziim," "owls" has "ostriches," "doleful creatures" has "Heb. Ochim," "and wild beasts of the island" has "Tim"; but the satyr has nothing appended to it either as to the original term or in explanation. It had appeared first in the Genevan translation, also without any note; the earlier versions having, "ostriches shall dwell there, and apes shall dance there." Goat is the ordinary meaning of the word; but in Lev. xvii, 7, 2 Chron. xi, 15, it represents some object of worship, rendered in our version "devils" in both places, the Septuagint giving "vain" or "false" "gods," and the Vulgate "demons," as also the Chaldee and the Syriac versions. But the Vulgate has "pilosus," "hairy ones" in Isaiah; Luther has "Feldgeist," and Calvin adopts "satyrs," not in any fabulous sense, but as actual appearances of the devil. In the last clause of the next verse the Vulgate has *sirenes*. Those objects of worship referred to no doubt had the form of wild goats, as in the Egyptian idolatry. The combined notion of demon and shaggy monster suggested satyrs or demons assuming such a shape—compare Rev. xviii, 2. Some writers would keep the true meaning of "wild shaggy goats" in harmony with the other animals in the dismal picture, ostriches, jackals, and wolves. The old Greek translator was sorely puzzled by the word Ziim, and he renders it by ass-centaurs. While the Authorized Version, as if in great doubt of the real meaning, puts Ziim and Ochim in the margin; the Genevan for the same reason keeps them untranslated in the

text (as Luther did), and inserts this note in the margin, "which were either wilde beasts or foules, or wicked spirits, whereby Satan deluded men as by the fairies, goblins, and such like fantasies." In two cases the Hebrew terms have been simply transferred, Behemoth and Leviathan. Matthews' Bible introduced Behemoth, and in a note refers it to the elephant; and so the Bishops', with a note on "elephant, so called for his hugeness, by which may be understood the devil."

No one can identify many of the plants and animals, and their names need a very careful revision, but ignorance did not need to excuse itself by variety of rendering: "thistle," 2 Kings. xiv, 9, is "thorn" in Prov. xxvi, 9; and "bramble" in Isaiah xxxiv, 13. "Owl" in Lev. xi, 16, Deut. xiv, 15, and often in Isaiah, becomes in the plural "ostriches," in Lam. iv, 3; and indeed the margin has "ostriches" in Job xxx, 29; "grasshopper" in Lev. xi, 22, is "locust" in 2 Chron. vii, 13; another term is "locust" throughout the Pentateuch, but "grasshopper" in Judges vi, 5, vii, 12, Jer. xlvi, 23. In these passages the image is that of numbers, and any one who has ever passed through a flight of locusts in Palestine must have a vivid idea of the interminable multitude, as it darkens the sky and presents the appearance of a broad-flaked snow storm, such as often falls in our month of February. The fabulous unicorn will pass out, Deut. xxxiii, 17. The name came from the Septuagint and Vulgate; but we read, "his horns are the horns of a reem," implying that the animal was not one-horned. It could not therefore be the rhinoceros, but the bison or urochs, the urus of Julius Cæsar. Behemoth may be the hippopotamus, and the leviathan the crocodile. The Hebrew term tzippor, occurring forty times, is only twice rendered sparrow, Ps. xxxiv, 4, cii, 7, and in all other places it is translated "bird," and five times "fowl," and that rightly, for it denotes any of the smaller birds. The term rendered "crane" is probably the swift (Isaiah xxxviii, 14), and the boys in Palestine call it still by the old name, Ziz. The song of birds is rarely alluded to; it is found in Ps. civ, 12, and the Song of Solomon ii, 12; but the Hebrew reads only "time of singing"—"of birds"

being supplied; and many suppose it to mean "time of pruning."

The "apple" was probably a citron, or rather an apricot. "Pannag," as in the Genevan and Bishops', is left untranslated in Ezekiel xxvii, 17. "Mustard seed" will remain in the parable till the plant, the image of rapid increase, be fully identified. "Spikenard," as a name, has no warrant in the Greek of Mark xiv, 3; it comes from the Vulgate, and its "*nardi spicati*." In Canticles i, 12, iv, 13, 14, the Latin and Greek versions have simply "*nard*." Tyndale has "ointment called *nardi*, pure and costly," the Rheims "precious spike-narde." "Spikenard" was introduced by the Genevan version. Our margin has "pure nard, or liquid nard." The Bishops' version, unable to make anything of the word, puts into its text "*narde pistike*," and the epithet may be a local or geographical word taken from the Indian district whence it was brought. Cedars, olives, figs, are well known; barley is everywhere; and as thorns and briars have been always abundant, the Hebrew has no less than eighteen words to express different kinds of them. The thorny nubk down near Jericho forms an impregnable fence. Six allied Hebrew words are rendered "oak," some of them being the "terebinth." But the translation "plain" is sometimes wrongly given, as in Gen. xiii, 18, where it should be "oak" or "terebinth" of Mamre.

The word rightly rendered "oil tree" in Isaiah xli, 19, is translated "olive tree" in 1 Kings vi, 23, and by "pine branches" in Nehemiah viii, 15. Perhaps the oleaster is meant. The "paper reeds" is a mistranslation in Isaiah xix, 7,

¹ The name of "Valley of the Kedron" may have a connection with some old groups of cedars, "Brook of the Cedars," John xviii, 1. *Χειμάρρου τῶν κεδρών*. Rabbinical authority states that on a bridge leading from the mount to the eastern gate of the temple were two great cedars, or "monsters of cedars," as Lightfoot calls them. The great orientalist is not him-

self inclined to adopt such a derivation of the name of the valley. The cedars of the Old Testament were not all Lebanon trees. Other species of firs are referred to under the general name. Indeed, our term "larch" is only the Hebrew or Arabic word with the article, "*l'arez*." Lightfoot, Works, vol. X, p. 82, ed. Pitman, London, 1823.

for the papyrus is mentioned in the same oracle. "Cockle," Job xxxi, 40, is an old Anglo-Saxon term, and the margin gives "noisome weeds"; but in Isaiah v, 2, 4, it is rendered "wild grapes."

"Rye," which is not indigenous in Palestine, should rather be "spelt," as in the margin, Exod. ix, 32; Isaiah xxviii, 25. Spelt is grown extensively in Palestine, and resembles wheat, but is rough, coarse, and bearded. The writer saw many fields of it some time ago, and was—as he had not seen it before—perplexed by it for a time, as it was not wheat on the one hand, nor rye on the other. Oats are not grown in Palestine; but there is a general term for "corn," or "cereals," one special term for "standing corn," and a third for "winnowed corn." There are special words for "green corn," "parched corn," "pounded corn," "old corn," and "a corn stack."

"Silk" occurs in Rev. xviii, 12, among the wondrous treasures of Babylon, and it is also found in Prov. xxxi, 22, in Ezekiel xvi, 10, 13; and in the margin, Gen. xli, 42, it is the alternative for the "fine linen" of the text, which is the proper rendering, and it has not such a marginal explanation anywhere else. "Silk" is the right translation in the Apocalypse. The term in Ezekiel means "drawn as fine as a hair," and is explained to mean silk by the lexicographers Hesychius and Suidas. Another Hebrew term, rendered "Damascus" in Amos iii, 12, has been taken to refer to damask—"on damask couches." Any reference to silk in the Old Testament is rather doubtful.

The Hebrew language abounded in specific topographical terms, which have not always been attended to in our version. It has distinctive words for hill, height, rock, cliff, crag; for spring,¹ well, pond, pool or tank, reservoir, cistern, trough; and for ravine, dale, valley, plain, plateau or downs, park, field, meadow, wady or dry water-course. It had also special names for city, hold, hamlet, villages, enclosures; and for wood, forest,

¹ John iv, 6, "Jacob's spring was there," *πηγή*, rendered "fountain" in James iii, 1; and in v, 11, the woman names the shaft "the well," *τὸ φρέαρ*.

grove, &c. In the Old Testament reference is sometimes made to the Negeb, vaguely rendered "the south," Psalm cxxvi, 4; to the Shephelah, or "low country," "valley" in Josh. xi, 16; to the Arabah and the circle of the Jordan; to the Mishor—downs or table-lands of Moab; and to the Sharon¹—the rich sea-board, especially between Cæsarea and Joppa.

It is not easy to find distinctive terms for Hebrew measures, weights, and coins. In some cases in the Old Testament the original name is kept—"an omer," "an ephah," "gerah," "shekel"—which must be made intelligible by a marginal explanation. In the New Testament some terms are translated, but the translation gives to the reader no more knowledge than would be given by the simple transference of the original word—such as a measure of wheat, three measures of meal, bushel, firkin, pieces of silver, piece of money, penny, pound, tribute money. The English terms do not correspond in value to the original names, and this is of special importance when some lesson or comparison depends on the coin or size of the measure. The proportion of the money to the grain, or the comparative dearth of the wheat, is lost to the reader in the vague rendering "a measure of wheat for a penny," Rev. vi, 6, and would be equally so in the more literal translation, "a choenix of wheat for a denarius," or that older annotation, which has passed into the text, "now an omer is the tenth part of an ephah," Exod. xvi, 36; and there is no marginal note, though it is of some importance to know how much manna each man gathered for a day's consumption. Nor is there any explanation of a "thousand silverlings," Isaiah vii, 23. Half-shekel and stater would not, indeed, be very intelligible, Matt. xvii, 24, 27. An American margin might explain a penny as "seventeen cents." Principal Campbell² waxes merry on the proposals which have been made to give a strict translation in British coin: "a measure of wheat for sevenpence halfpenny," "the chief priests covenanted with Judas for three pounds fifteen shillings sterling," "why was

¹ It is usually in the Old Testament מִשְׁכָּן, with the definite article, as in Acts ix, 35. The combination of article and noun produced the form *āšāpāna*, much as מִשְׁכָּן, with the demonstrative pronoun הַזֶּה, produced *Eūphrātes*, Euphrates.

² "On the Gospels," p. 257.

not this ointment sold for nine pounds seven shillings and sixpence?" "six pounds five shillings would not purchase bread sufficient."

As our simple purpose is to give some examples in which a revision might promote clearness and uniformity, we pause with a mere reference to the Greek particles.¹ Though some of these particles occasionally almost defy translation, they give life and variety to the expression, adding flavour to sweetness, pungency to strength, and raciness to points of doubt, question, or modification, and they are ever gleaming through the paragraph like the shifting colours of a dove's neck. To analyze their nature and signification might not be so difficult, but how to express them in English as curt as themselves, is the critical task; for then, as at the opening up of the flower, the fragrance is dissipated in the rude process. There needs a delicacy of perception, an instinctive power of seizing on the shade of idea presented, which may also be modified by the structure of the clause and the position of these subtle words in it.² The translator must be endowed with the rare gift of a psychological oneness with evangelists and apostles, and this ideal identity will bestow such keenness of insight and true sympathy of spirit, that for the time the author's current of thought and reasoning becomes that of his interpreter. The second mind grows into the original mind, and the sense of his words is at once apprehended and felt. And while so much of this qualification is born with the gifted seer, a long course of earnest study is, at the same time, indispensable; for he that renders the New Testament should possess, not only sound scholarship, ardent integrity, and freedom from prepossession; but should be also disciplined to the dexterous handling of philological instruments, and be endowed with the patient power of listening to all arguments, on every side and aspect, syntactic or exegetical, of a question, so that, after a leisurely survey of the premises, a sound con-

¹ Such particles as *μή, μηδέ; γέ* also in several combinations, *καί, τε*, in various combinations, *περ, τοι, ήτοι . . . ή, άρα, άρα, &c.*
αν, ειπερ, ου μή, γάρ, ουδέ . . . ουδέ,
ουτε . . . ουτε, ει καί, καὶ ει, εαν, ² Blackwall's Sacred Classics, vol. I, p. 223.

clusion may be reached. And all in dependence on the "Interpreter, One among a thousand," who guides into all the truth.

Such emendations as have been suggested in the preceding pages may be adopted or not in any revision; if they were, they would bring the translation into a closer conformity with the original, and would not change the style of its fine old hallowed English. Hallam, indeed, asserts that this English "is so enthusiastically praised, that no one is permitted to qualify, or even explain, the ground of this approbation." After muttering some dissatisfaction with such eulogistic opinions, he adds in self-vindication, "it is not the English of the reign of James I, . . . it is not the English of Daniel, or Raleigh, or Bacon." True; and had its English been that of the epoch or of the authors named, it would not have lived so long, nor taken or kept such a hold of the nation. For, as Dr. Newman—still maintaining his own views—declares, and his estimate is based on a long and varied experience: "Bible religion is both the recognized title and the best description of English religion. It consists, not in rites or creeds, but mainly in having the Bible read in Church, in the family, and in private. Now I am far indeed from undervaluing that mere knowledge of Scripture which is imparted to the population thus promiscuously. At least in England, it has to a certain point made up for great and grievous losses in its Christianity. The reiteration again and again, in fixed course in the public service, of the words of inspired teachers under both Covenants, and that in grave majestic English, has in matter of fact been to our people a vast benefit. It has attuned their minds to religious thoughts; it has given them a high moral standard; it has served them in associating religion with compositions which, even humanly considered, are among the most sublime and beautiful ever written; especially, it has impressed upon them the series of Divine Providences in behalf of man from his creation to his end, and, above all, the words, deeds, and sacred sufferings of Him in whom all the Providences of God centre."

¹ Literature of Europe, vol. II, p. 366, 4th edition, London, 1854. ² Grammar of Assent, p. 56, London, 1874.

The subject of Revision was brought before the Convocation of Canterbury in February, 1870, and the result of several discussions was embodied in the following propositions:—

"1. That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken.

"2. That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorized Version.

"3. That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except when in the judgment of the most competent scholars such change is necessary.

"4. That in such necessary changes, the style of the language employed in the existing version be closely followed.

"5. That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the cooperation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong."

To carry out these resolutions a joint committee was appointed, and at its meeting in May, 1870, it was resolved—

"I. That the Committee, appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury at its last Session, separate itself into two Companies, the one for the revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament, the other for the revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament.

"II. That the Company for the revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament consist of the Bishops of St. Davids, Llandaff, Ely, Lincoln, and Bath and Wells, and of the following Members from the Lower House, Archdeacon Rose, Canon Selwyn, Dr. Jebb, and Dr. Kay.

"III. That the Company for the revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament consist of the Bishops of Winchester, Gloucester and Bristol, and Salisbury, and of the following Members from the Lower House, the Prolocutor, the Deans of Canterbury and Westminster, and Canon Blakesley.

"IV. That the first portion of the work to be undertaken by the Old Testament Company, be the revision of the Authorized Version of the Pentateuch.

"V. That the first portion of the work to be undertaken by the New Testament Company, be the revision of the Authorized Version of the Synoptical Gospels.

"VI. That the following Scholars and Divines be invited to join the Old Testament Company:—Dr. W. L. Alexander, Professor Chenery, Canon Cook, Professor A. B. Davidson, Dr. B. Davies, Professor Fairbairn, Rev. F. Field, Dr. Ginsburg, Dr. Gotch, Archdeacon Harrison, Professor Leathes, Professor McGill, Canon Payne Smith, Professor J. S. Perowne, Professor Plumptre, Canon Pusey, Dr. Wright (British Museum), W. A. Wright (Cambridge).

"VII. That the following Scholars and Divines be invited to join the New Testament Company:—Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Angus, Dr. Eadie, Rev. F. J. A. Hort, Rev. W. G. Humphry, Canon Kennedy, Archdeacon Lee, Dr. Lightfoot, Professor Milligan, Professor Moulton, Dr. J. H. Newman, Professor Newth, Dr. A. Roberts, Rev. G. Vance Smith, Dr. Scott (Balliol Coll.), Rev. F. Scrivener, Dr. Tregelles, Dr. Vaughan, Canon Westcott.

"VIII. That the General Principles to be followed by both Companies be as follows:—

"1. To introduce as few alterations as possible into the Text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness.

"2. To limit, as far as possible, the expressions of such alterations to the language of the Authorized and earlier English versions.

"3. Each Company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereinafter is provided.

"4. That the Text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; and that when the Text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorized Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin.

"5. To make or retain no change in the Text on the second final revision by each Company, except *two-thirds* of those present approve of the same, but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities.

"6. In every case of proposed alteration that may have given rise to discussion, to defer the voting thereupon till the next Meeting, whensoever the same shall be required by *one-third* of those present at the Meeting, such intended vote to be announced in the notice for the next Meeting.

"7. To revise the headings of chapters, pages, paragraphs, italics, and punctuation.

"8. To refer, on the part of each Company, when considered desirable, to Divines, Scholars, and Literary Men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions.

"IX. That the work of each Company be communicated to the other as it is completed, in order that there may be as little deviation from uniformity in language as possible.

"X. That the Special or Bye-rules for each Company be as follows:—

"1. To make all corrections in writing previous to the Meeting.

"2. To place all the corrections due to textual considerations on the left hand margin, and all other corrections on the right hand margin.

"3. To transmit to the Chairman, in case of being unable to attend, the corrections proposed in the portion agreed upon for consideration."

Some of these scholars did not act, or resigned, and others, alas! have died. The list stands at present as follows:—

I. The Old Testament Revision Company.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Winchester (Chairman); The Right Rev. the Bishop of Bath and Wells; The Right Rev. the Bishop of Llandaff (Corresponding Member); the Very Rev. the Dean of Canterbury; the Ven. the Archdeacon of Maidstone; the Rev. Dr. Alexander, Edinburgh; R. L. Bensly, Esq., University Library, Cambridge; Professor Birrell, St. Andrew's; Dr. Chance, Sydenham Hill; Professor Chenery, London; the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, Oxford; Professor Davidson, Edinburgh; Principal Douglas, Glasgow; S. R. Driver, New College, Oxford, Esq.; the Rev. C. J. Elliot, Winkfield Vicarage, Windsor; the Rev. F. Field, Heigham, Norwich; the Rev. J. D. Geden, Wesleyan College, Didsbury, Manchester; Dr. Ginsburg, Holm-lea, Berks; the Rev. Dr. Kay, Chelmsford; Professor Leathes,

London; the Rev. J. R. Lumby, Cambridge; Canon Perowne, Cambridge; the Rev. A. H. Sayce, Oxford; Professor W. R. Smith, Aberdeen; Professor Weir, Glasgow; Professor Wright, Cambridge; W. Aldis Wright, Esq., (Secretary), Trinity College, Cambridge.

II. The New Testament Company.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Chairman); the Right Rev. the Bishop of Salisbury; the Very Rev. the Prolocutor, Dean of Lichfield; the Very Rev. the Dean of Westminster, the Very Rev. the Dean of Rochester; the Very Rev. the Dean of Lincoln; the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Dublin; the Right Rev. the Bishop of St. Andrews; the Rev. Dr. Angus, Baptist College London; Professor David Brown, Aberdeen; Professor Eadie, Glasgow; the Rev. Dr. Hort, Cambridge; the Rev. W. G. Humphry, Vicar of St. Martin's in the Fields, London; Canon Kennedy, Cambridge; the Ven. the Archdeacon of Dublin; Canon Lightfoot, Cambridge; Professor Milligan, Aberdeen; the Rev. Dr. Moulton, The Leys, Cambridge; Principal Newth, New College, London; Professor Palmer, Oxford; Professor Roberts, St. Andrews; Prebendary Scrivener, Gerrans, Grampound (now Vicar of Hendon); the Rev. Dr. G. Vance Smith, Sheffield; the Rev. the Master of the Temple; Canon Westcott, Cambridge; the Rev. J. Troutbeck (Secretary), 4 Dean's Yard, Westminster.

The work of Revision began on the 22nd of June, 1870, and has been carried on with perfect cordiality, and every promise of ultimate success.

Similar Boards of scholars and divines for the revision of the Authorized Version have been organized in the United States, and their work has been carried on in harmony with the British Companies that meet from time to time in the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster Abbey.

INDEX.

"So essential did I consider an Index to be to every book, that I proposed to bring a Bill into parliament to deprive an author who publishes a book without an Index of the privilege of copyright: and, moreover, to subject him, for his offence, to a pecuniary penalty."—LORD CAMPBELL, *Lives of the Chief Justices*.

- ÆLFRIC's translations of Scripture into Saxon, i, 15, 16.
his Saxon grammar, i, 79, note 3.
"Abate," Cockeram's reference to the word as obsolete, ii, 234, n. 2.
Aidan employs his associates in reading the Scriptures, i, 4.
Aldhelm praises nuns for study of Scripture, i, 5.
his Anglo-Saxon version of the Psalms and his songs, i, 10, 11.
Aldred and Anglo-Saxon gloss of Cuthbert Gospels, i, 14.
Ales (Alex.), his controversy with Cochlaeus, i, 129, n. 1.
account of, i, 247, 248.
on Tyndale's version in Scotland, i, 248.
introduced by Crumwell to Convocation of 1534, i, 338.
Alfred's translations into Anglo-Saxon, i, 12, 13.
Allen (William) and Douai version, ii, 115, 116.
Anderson (Chris.), his Annals of English Bible, i, 125.
Anderson (Andro), his Bibles and their blunders, ii, 317, 321.
Andrews (St.), at one time capital of Scotland, i, 245, n. 1.
Andrewes (Bishop), notice of, ii, 186.
Anglo-Norman, early translations in, i, 30, 32.
the Ormulum, i, 30, n. 1, 2.
story of Genesis and Exodus, i, 31.
Salus Animi, i, 31.
Schorham and Hampole, i, 31, 32.
Anglo-Saxon invasion, effect of, on British Christianity, i, 3.
language, brief account of, i, 5, 9.
language, how influenced by Norman French, i, 25, 29.
literature, cessation of, in consequence of Norman conquest, i, 27, n. 2.
literature, how far it spread into Scotland, i, 33, 34.
MSS. regarded as useless, i, 17, n. 1.
Mark (Skeat's), changes in language shown by, i, 28, n. 1.
translations (earliest) of Bible into, i, 4, 5.
by Cædmon, i, 9, 10.
Guthlac, i, 10.
Aldhelm, i, 11.
Bede, i, 11, 12.
Alfred, i, 13.
glosses, i, 14, 17.
versions, necessarily from Latin, i, 17.
versions, only the wreck of, have come down to us, i, 17.
words, proportion of, in English, i, 6, 7, n.
Anne of Bohemia, her study of Gospel in English, i, 61.
Anne (Queen), in title of Coverdale's Bible, changed into Queen Jane, i, 267, 272, 273, 302.
and Harman, i, 231.
and Tyndale's "Obedience of a Christian Man," i, 231, n. 3.
and copy of Tyndale's revised New Testament on vellum, i, 232.

Apocrypha, Coverdale on, i, 267.
 Coverdale and Rogers on, i, 328, 332.
 Lightfoot and others on, ii, 301, 302.
 characterized, ii, 302.
 when Bibles began to be printed without, ii, 302.
 Arbutnot and Bassandyne, printers of first Bible issued in Scotland, ii, 43, 44.
 Arundel, constitutions of, i, 61.
 hostility to Wycliffe's Bible, i, 81, 82.
 influence in passing severe measures against heretics, i, 87, 88.
 connection with Scotland, i, 81, n. 1.
 Askew (Anne), martyrdom of, i, 411, 412.
 "Assembly's Annotations," persons concerned in the work, ii, 300.
 Authorized Version, question of, discussed at Westminster, in 1530, i, 184.
 Warham's manifesto regarding, i, 259, 260.
 Latimer's letter to king, i, 261, 262.
 Great Bible, authorized version for twenty-eight years, i, 383, n. 3.
 AUTHORIZED VERSION, commonly so called, ii, 159-334.
 origin of, in proposal of Dr. Reynolds at Hampton Court Conference, ii, 174, 175.
 proposal for, favoured by king's fondness for Biblical lore, ii, 179.
 Bancroft's correspondence regarding, ii, 180-182.
 king too poor to aid with money, ii, 182, 183.
 Cecil's letter to Vice-Chancellor and heads of colleges, ii, 183, 184.
 Board of Revisers, ii, 184-186.
 companies, ii, 185.
 short notices of some of them, ii, 186-190.
 compensated by ecclesiastical preferment, ii, 190, 191.
 directions for the revision, ii, 191-193.
 describe their work as revision, not translation, ii, 194.
 justify translations of Scripture, ii, 196, 198.
 commend Scripture study, ii, 199, 200.
 their spirit, ii, 200.
 method of procedure, ii, 201, 220.
 last revision, ii, 201.
 work completed, ii, 202.
 title, ii, 202.
 two issues, ii, 202.

Authorized Version—*continued*.
 Board of Revisers, dedication to king, ii, 202-204.
 clause, "appointed to be read in churches," without authority, ii, 204.
 no Nonconformist or Scottish scholar employed in the work, ii, 205.
 welcome given to new volume as expressed by Fuller, ii, 207.
 use made of the originals, ii, 208.
 their Hebrew text, ii, 209, 210.
 their Greek text, ii, 211.
 different readings given in margin, ii, 210, 212-214.
 marginal renderings and notes, ii, 214-217.
 historical notes later interpolations, ii, 217.
 not a few marginal renderings preferable, ii, 218.
 use of previous versions, ii, 218, 219, 221-225.
 other helps, ii, 219.
 choice of words, ii, 225, 226, 233.
 excellence of its English style, ii, 226-228.
 Hallam and Newman on, ii, 480.
 literal renderings of Hebrew clauses, ii, 228.
 ingenious turns of diction, ii, 229, 230.
 preponderance of Saxon, ii, 231.
 Latin terms, ii, 231.
 terms occurring only once, ii, 233-235.
 rules as quoted at Synod of Dort, ii, 235.
 license taken in translating Apocrypha, ii, 235, 236.
 marginal notes in Apocrypha, i, 236.
 Biblical Saxon compounds objected to by Geddes and Hume, ii, 237.
 freedom from "inkhorn terms" and intricate constructions, ii, 237, 238.
 universality of adaptation, ii, 239.
 English tongue in its best state at time of translation, ii, 239-240.
 marginal terms now out of use, ii, 242-244.
 words and phrases in contents of chapters which have passed away, ii, 244-246.
 obsolete terms in text, ii, 246-248.
 archaisms, ii, 248-250.
 words in their Latin sense, ii, 250-253.
 peculiar phrases and syntax, ii, 253-255.

Authorized Version—*continued*.
 different forms of preterite and variation in other forms, ii, 255, 256.
 old use of "his," ii, 256, 257.
 spelling changed in modern editions, ii, 258.
 use of "be," "you," "that," ii, 259.
 "whiles," conjunctions joining different moods, strong preterite in one clause and auxiliary in other, ii, 260.
 old use of grammatical numbers and other peculiarities, ii, 260-262.
 Hostility to the version anticipated, ii, 264.
 attacks of Broughton, ii, 265, 266.
 attack of Dr. Gell, ii, 266.
 Ward's "Errata of the Protestant Bible," ii, 267, 268.
 charged with favouring the notion of witchcraft to please the king, ii, 268-270.
 "God Save the King," ii, 270, 271.
 ecclesiastical predilections, ii, 271, 272.
 doctrinal predilections, ii, 272-275.
 anti-Popish leanings, ii, 275, 276.
 Beza not always followed, ii, 276-279.
 theological bias in the margin, ii, 279.
 Supplemental words and use of italics, ii, 280-285.
 italic words which should be excluded, ii, 281.
 some supplied words expository, ii, 282-284.
 some italic words unwarranted, ii, 285.
 Headings of chapters, character of, ii, 286, 287.
 Printing and Editions of, ii, 288-334.
 early patents, ii, 288, 289.
 Barker's edition, ii, 288, 289.
 inaccuracy of, ii, 291-294.
 first issues, ii, 289-293.
 brought into conformity with Bishops' and Geneva, ii, 291.
 edition of Buck and Daniel, ii, 295, 296.
 charges against Independents and Presbyterians in connection with Buck and Daniel's edition, ii, 296.
 Baxter's copy of Buck and Daniel's edition, ii, 296.
 Scott's reference to Buck and Daniel's edition, ii, 296.
 Quaker's Bible, ii, 297.
 foreign editions and editions of Field and Hill, errors of, ii, 297-299.
 Field's Pearl Bible, ii, 299.

Authorized Version—*continued*.
 "Assembly's Annotations," ii, 300, 301.
 notes (the old), anecdote showing desire for, ii, 301.
 Field's heavy folio referred to by Pepys, ii, 302.
 Tennyson (Archbishop), edition under patronage of, ii, 303.
 Paris (Dr.), edition of, ii, 303.
 Blayney's (Dr.), edition, great pains taken with, ii, 304.
 errors in, ii, 305, 306.
 editions of smaller size, Lemoine's complaint regarding, ii, 306.
 state of text, complaint of Committee of Dissenting ministers regarding, ii, 306, 307.
 American revised edition, ii, 307, 308.
 marginal references, growth of, ii, 308.
 punctuation, ii, 308.
 paragraph marks and division in chapters and verses, ii, 309.
 Macklin, Baskerville, and others, editions of, 309.
 Cambridge Bible of 1858, very good edition, ii, 309.
 Dublin edition of 1714 the earliest printed in Ireland, ii, 309.
 America, early editions printed in, ii, 309.
 Arthur (father and daughter), printers of, ii, 309, 310.
 Scrivener's (Dr.) Cambridge Paragraph Bible, ii, 310.
 Cromwell's soldiers, their pocket Bibles, ii, 310, n. 1.
 editions of in Scotland, ii, 316-321.
 Hart's, ii, 316.
 edition with "Popish pictures," ii, 316.
 Anderson's editions, numerous and gross blunders of, ii, 317-321.
 Watson's (James) Bibles.
 inaccuracy of printed Bible brought before General Assembly, ii, 321.
 revision, proposal for, by John Row, ii, 322-324.
 patentee, only one, for printing Bible in Scotland, ii, 324.
 BACON, his preference of "charity" to "love," ii, 133, n. 1.
 Bainham racked in the tower, i, 192.
 martyred, i, 207.
 Bancroft at Hampton Court Conference, ii, 170-172.
 connection with Authorized Version, ii, 180-193.

- Bancroft—*continued*.
 charged by Dr. Hill with making the Authorized Version speak prelatial language, ii, 271, 272.
 died, ii, 272, n. 1.
- Band (The Common) of Protestant nobles in Scotland, ii, 40.
 (The Italian) ludicrous mistake in regard to, ii, 367, n. 1.
- Barclay's "Shyp of Follys," its honest title-page, i, 281.
- Barker or Barker (Chris.), printer of Tomson's Genevan New Testament, ii, 34, nn. 2, 4.
- Barker (Robert), his salary as royal printer, ii, 184.
 and first issue of Authorized Version, ii, 202.
- Barker (Matthew), his claim to sole right of printing the Authorized Version, ii, 201, 202.
- Barkers (The) and printing of Authorized Version, ii, 288, 289.
- Barker and Bill's edition with "not" left out in seventh commandment, ii, 294.
- Barlow's (William) vacillations, i, 378.
- Barlow's (Dr.) account of origin of Authorized Version, ii, 174.
 account of Hampton Court conference, ii, 174-176.
- Barnes (Prior) and Tyndale's New Testament, i, 167, 168.
 and Coverdale, i, 255, 256.
- Baxter's copy of Cambridge Bible, ii, 296.
- Beaton (Card.), his list of intended victims, i, 414.
- Becke's (Edmund) editions of Matthew's Bible, i, 346.
- Becon's "News from Heaven" and "Welcome of Great Bible," i, 386, n. 1.
 on free permission of Bible reading, i, 406.
 Latin terms used by, and by Ascham, Bacon, Jeremy Taylor, and Hooker, ii, 238, n. 1.
- Bede of Jarrow, his devotion to Bible translation, i, 11, 12.
 his MS., i, 12, n. 1.
 his exhortation to Egbert, i, 4.
- Bellfrith the anchorite, i, 14.
- Beowulf, poem of, i, 3, n. 3.
- Berthelet and printing of Tyndale's first New Testament issued in England, i, 240.
 and Whitchurch willing to print second edition of Great Bible at 10s., i, 372.
- Beza, his influence on Genevan Bible, ii, 16 ss., 30.
- Bible, a people's book, i, 37, 38.
 burning of, i, 173, 177, 184, 185, 429.
 sanctifies all relations, i, 56.
- Bible (English), wonderful and suggestive history of, ii, 331-334.
 number of chapters, verses, letters in, ii, 330.
- Bible readings, scenes at, and royal proclamations regarding, i, 389-391.
 abuses in connection with, i, 407.
 cruel restrictions on, i, 409-412.
- Bibles (mediaeval) and Charlemagne, ii, 310, n. 1.
- Bible Society and daily issue of Bibles, ii, 347, n. 1.
- Bilney and discovery of Tyndale's New Testament at Oxford, i, 175.
 his martyrdom, i, 207.
- BISHOPS' BIBLE, ii, 59-104.
 circumstances which prepared the way for this revision, ii, 66.
 Parker's connection with, ii, 67.
 coadjutors of Parker, ii, 69, 70.
 short rules for revisers, ii, 70.
 the various translators, ii, 71, 72.
 initials at end of some of the books, ii, 72, 73.
 the version finished, ii, 73.
 Parker's letter to Cecil, ii, 73, 74.
 published, ii, 76.
 description of title-page, ii, 76, 77.
 archbishop's preface, ii, 77.
 no royal confirmation given to the Bible, ii, 78, 79.
 enactments in its favour by Convocation, ii, 78.
 Great Bible chiefly followed in Old Testament, ii, 79.
 critical remarks of Lawrence, ii, 79-83.
 edition of 1572 described, ii, 84.
 influence of Tyndale on New Testament of Bishops', ii, 84.
 collations of first and second editions, ii, 84-85.
 Great Bible and Bishops' in historical books, ii, 86.
 collation of Great Bible, Genevan, and Bishops', ii, 87-92.
 notes, ii, 92, 93.
 archaic terms, ii, 93, 94.
 Burleigh's portrait, ii, 94.
 Bible of 1575, ii, 94.
 price, ii, 94.
 literal translations, ii, 95-97.
 supplements, ii, 97, 98.

- Bishops' Bible—*continued*.
 notice of the article and small connecting words, ii, 99.
 want of uniformity, ii, 100.
 attempt to classify books of Scripture, ii, 100.
 places not edifying pointed out, ii, 100.
 Great Bible superseded, ii, 101.
 attempts to supersede Genevan, ii, 101-102.
 three versions in circulation, ii, 102.
 Gregory Martin, with regard to, ii, 103.
- Bishops' prescribed as basis of Authorized Version, ii, 191.
 revised copy or copies of, used at press, not preserved, ii, 290.
- Blayney's annotations added to Authorized Version, ii, 217.
- Blunt's sneer at Tyndale's New Testament as taken from secondary sources, i, 360, n. 3.
- Bodley's patent for printing Genevan Bible, ii, 32.
 application for extension of patent, ii, 32, 33.
- Boel's, C., frontispiece to first issue of Authorized Version, ii, 202.
- Bobemia, influence of Wycliffe's Bible on, i, 61, 62.
- Bonner, at Paris, aids Grafton and Coverdale, i, 359, 360.
 his injunctions with regard to reading of Great Bible, i, 400.
 sets up six Bibles in St. Paul's, i, 400.
 and Bible burning, i, 412.
 his mandate against texts of Scripture on church walls, i, 427, 428.
- Bradhee, martyrdom of, i, 87.
- Breeches Bible, ii, 15.
- Borthwick, Lord, charged with having New Testament in English, i, 415.
- Bois or Boyd, John, ii, 184.
- Bowes' translation and "phenomenon," i, 233, n. 2.
- Bromyard's, John, opposition to Wycliffe and his views, i, 84.
- Buckenham, Prior, and reading of Scriptures, i, 203.
- Busche, Herman von dem, on Tyndale's learning, i, 137.
- CARDMON and his sacred poems, i, 9-10.
- Calderwood's *Altare Damascenum* and King James, ii, 170.
- Cambray, treaty of, and the printing of Lutheran books, i, 179.
- Campbell of Cessnock and the reading of Bible in vernacular, i, 96.
- Campeggio, Card., congratulations on burning of Bible, i, 173.
- Campion, the Jesuit, and assassination of queen, ii, 114.
 his Latin prayers at Tyburn, i, 422.
- Cartwright's attack on Rheims version interdicted by Whitgift, ii, 149.
- Castro, Philip's Spanish chaplain, and sermon on toleration, i, 433.
- Cawood, his issues of Great Bible, ii, 101.
- Cawood and Jugge, Queen Elizabeth's printers, ii, 32.
- Chapters first divided into verses in Whittingham's New Testament, ii, 8.
 number of, as well as of verses, words, letters, in English Bible, ii, 330.
- "Characters," Wotton's use of the word, ii, 233.
- Charlemagne and grant to monks of St. Bertin, ii, 310, n. 1.
- Chaucer on French learned by young ladies at school, i, 25, n. 1.
 his language, i, 71, 72.
 on mendicant orders, i, 48.
 on earlier purity of Lollards, i, 94.
- Chichele, the primate, and the ungraving of Wycliffe's bones, i, 82.
 counsels war with France, i, 90.
- Cheke's, Sir John, translations into Old English, i, 422.
- Chester, Col., on Roger's notes, i, 331, n. 1.
 on character of Coverdale, i, 433, 437.
- Cobham's, Lord, death, i, 87, 88.
- Cochlaus, his hostility to Tyndale, i, 129, 131.
 reply to Ales, i, 248.
 complains of ingratitude of Henry VIII, i, 248.
- Coke on heresy as leprosy of soul, i, 86, n. 5.
- Coke, Sir Edward, refuses to take oath against Lolleries, i, 88.
- Colins, John, Alice, Robert, and Thomas, and Bible reading, i, 92, 93.
- "Commence" not used in Bible or Milton, ii, 234, n. 2.
- Constantine (Vicar) and More, i, 169, 181.
- Cottysford and seizure of Garnett, i, 163, 165.
- COVERDALE's birth and early years i, 255.

Coverdale—*continued*.

enjoys favour of Crumwell, i, 256.
 leaves his convent and dedicates himself to preaching the Gospel, i, 256.
 influence on Thomas Topley, i, 256.
 retreats to Continent, i, 257.
 connection with Tyndale, i, 257.
 in obscurity, i, 258.
 letter to Crumwell, i, 258.
 his knowledge of German, i, 258.
 work of translation, when commenced by him, i, 258-265.
 stimulated by growing desire for Authorized English Bible, i, 258-265.
 his Bible published, i, 266, 267.
 title-page, dedication and prologue, i, 266-268.
 preface to Apocrypha, i, 268-270.
 where and by whom printed, i, 270, 271.
 changes of title, i, 272, 273, 280.
 the originator of the translation, i, 273-276.
 the one workman, i, 276-278.
 principles of translation, i, 278, 279.
 not taken from Hebrew and Greek text, i, 279-281.
 sources of the version, i, 281, 282.
 Whittaker's blunders in regard to, i, 282-285.
 his notes, sources of, 286-292.
 collation showing use made by Coverdale of German versions, i, 292-294.
 his New Testament has Tyndale's for its basis, i, 295, 296.
 proportion of Coverdale's and Tyndale's renderings retained in Authorized Version, i, 296, 297.
 exaggerated praise of Geddes, i, 297.
 quaint and antique renderings, i, 298-300.
 obsolete terms, i, 301.
 always musical, i, 301, 302.
 editions with "the kyng's most gracious license" on title-page, i, 302.
 the Diglott, i, 302-304.
 editions of 304, 305.
 misprint on title-page of Coverdale's Bible, printed at Zürich, i, 305.
 his connection with Great Bible (see Great Bible).
 and Matthew, i, 329-331.
 goes abroad on fall of Crumwell, i, 431.
 Bishop of Exeter under Edward VI, i, 431.

Coverdale—*continued*.

his life in danger under Mary, i, 431.
 saved by intercession of king of Denmark, i, 432.
 returns home at the accession of Elizabeth, i, 434.
 Grindal's interest in him, i, 435, 436.
 his poverty, i, 436-439.
 death, i, 437.
 epitaph, i, 440.
 character, i, 252, 356, 364, 437, 439.
 Cox (Bishop of Ely), and project for Bishops' Bible, ii, 69.
 Cranmer (Arch.), his project for translation of Bible, i, 264, 265.
 connection with Matthew's Bible, i, 335, 336, 340.
 connection with Great Bible, i, 353, 357.
 new edition of Great Bible, i, 372.
 his prologue, i, 375-378.
 defeats Gardyners proposal for Latinized version, i, 405.
 his instructions to Bucer and Fagius, i, 420.
 and burning of Joan of Kent, i, 424.
 his martyrdom, 430.
 Craws (Paul) burned at St. Andrews, i, 96.
 Crumwell, and efforts for release of Tyndale, i, 239-243.
 and origination of Coverdale's Bible, i, 274.
 Coverdale's Diglott dedicated to, i, 304.
 connection with Matthew's Bible, i, 335, 336.
 at pinnacle of his power, i, 338.
 and Taverner's edition of Matthew's Bible, i, 343.
 and Great Bible, i, 355, 357, 364, 366.
 copies of Great Bible on parchment sent to him and king, i, 357, 358.
 prepares measures for circulation of Great Bible, i, 364.
 patent for printing Great Bible, i, 373.
 his rise and fall, i, 394.
 "Defender of the Faith," i, 263, n. 1.
 Devonshire, insurrection in, against English Bible and service, i, 422.
 Dewes (Rev. Alfred), on Authorized Version, ii, 353, n. 1.
 "Dialogue on the Exchequer," and intermarriage of English and Normans, i, 22.

Donne and Philips betray Tyndale, i, 238, 239.
 Dort (Synod of), and rules for translators of Authorized Version, ii, 201, 235, 242, 286.
 Douai "Seminarie" and English Catholics, ii, 114, 15.
 DOUAI AND RHEIMS VERSION, ii, 107-155.
 taken from Vulgate, ii, 107.
 originated with Popish exiles under Elizabeth, ii, 113.
 the translators, some account of, ii, 115, 116.
 New Testament published, ii, 116.
 title, ii, 116.
 the preface, ii, 117.
 the motives it assigns for the translation, ii, 117-121.
 for the Annotations, ii, 123.
 reasons for close adherence to Latin, ii, 123-125.
 "Greeke added in margent," ii, 125, 126.
 Fulke's attack, ii, 126, 127.
 Cartwright's answer to the preface, ii, 127.
 reasons for translating from Vulgate, ii, 128.
 want of charity towards Protestants, ii, 129.
 the Greek text ever before them, ii, 129.
 Latin terms not rendered, ii, 130-133.
 familiar Saxon phrases, ii, 134, 135.
 enriched vocabulary of Authorized Version, ii, 135.
 uniformity of rendering, ii, 136.
 Rheims New Testament and Mary Queen of Scots, ii, 136.
 Old Testament published, ii, 137.
 description of, ii, 137.
 publication delayed from lack of means, ii, 137, 138.
 addresses prefixed to Old Testament, ii, 138.
 why the Latin text translated rather than Hebrew or Greek, ii, 138, 139, 140.
 why some words are not translated, ii, 140.
 Latinized English, ii, 141.
 examples from Psalter, ii, 141, 142.
 idiomatic renderings, ii, 143.
 incomprehensible renderings, ii, 144.
 notes, theological, ii, 144, 145.
 list of words not familiar to the vulgar reader, ii, 145.
 how the version was regarded by hostile observers, ii, 146, 147.

Douai and Rheims Version—*continued*.
 controversy between Martin and Fulke in regard to rendering of proper names, ii, 147, 148.
 attacks of Rheims translators on all English versions, ii, 148.
 replies of Whitgift, Cartwright, and Bulkeley, ii, 149.
 Catholic translators did not make use of Wycliffe, but now and then coincide with Genevan Version, ii, 150.
 their table of Protestant errors, ii, 150, 152.
 changes in subsequent editions, ii, 153.
 Dr. Lingard and Cardinal Wiseman on the changes in the translation, ii, 154.
 English terms due to old Latin Bible, or Vulgate, ii, 154.
 theological nomenclature derived from Latin Church, ii, 155.
 use of Rheims by translators of Authorized Version, ii, 219.
 Durham Cathedral, insurgents enter and destroy Bibles, ii, 79.
 Edfrid, his translations of Scripture into Anglo-Saxon, i, 5.
 Edward, the Confessor, and the introduction of French, i, 19, 20.
 III., relation of, to English tongue, i, 24.
 the two races perfectly united under, i, 70.
 VI., measures in favour of English Bible during his reign, i, 420-424.
 numerous editions of Bible in his reign, i, 423.
 Elizabeth (Queen), difficulties of early part of her reign, ii, 59.
 Bible again starts into prominence, ii, 61.
 a diligent student of Scripture, ii, 61, 62.
 injunctions for the purchase of Bibles, ii, 62.
 in religion an enigma, ii, 63.
 eagerness for uniformity, ii, 64.
 and Parker's wife, ii, 64, n. 2.
 would not consent that the Bibles in circulation should be either abled or disabled, ii, 65.
 various editions in circulation in her reign, ii, 66.
 Elyot (Sir Thomas) undertakes task of seizing Tyndale at Antwerp, i, 237, 238.

- Emperowr (Marten), printer of Tyndale's revised New Testament, i, 226.
- Endhoven (Christopher of) issues third edition of Tyndale's New Testament, and is arrested, i, 175.
- Hacket's demand that he be banished, i, 176.
- his widow prints George Joye's New Testament, i, 217.
- English, first occurrence of term, according to Lappenberg, i, 6, nn.
- language, gradual ascendancy of, i, 23-25.
- changes in, from influence of Norman-French, i, 25-29.
- first king's speech in, and first statutes recorded in, i, 24.
- influence of Danish on, i, 25, n. 3.
- growth of, in time of Wycliffe, i, 70, 71.
- Grimm in regard to, ii, 226.
- in its most perfect state when Authorized Version was made, ii, 239-241.
- Erasmus, his fear with regard to study of Hebrew and philology, i, 91.
- at Cambridge, i, 104.
- Seeborn and Lee on his "Novum Instrumentum," i, 117, n. 1.
- the publication of his Greek New Testament an epoch in history of Western Christendom, i, 141, 142.
- and the term "Vulgarius," i, 255.
- Fisher (Bishop) and burning of hundreds of books, i, 167.
- Fogny (John), printer of Rheims version, ii, 117.
- Forrest (Henry), of Linlithgow, burned at St. Andrews for having New Testament in English, i, 248.
- Thomas, vicar of Dollar, tried and burned in effigy, i, 415.
- Forshall and Madden's edition of Wycliffe, i, 69.
- Frankfort, troubles among exiles at, ii, 4.
- Froschover and printing of Coverdale's Bible, i, 270.
- blunders in title-pages of English Bibles, i, 280.
- misprint in Coverdale's Bible printed at Zurich, i, 305.
- Fry (of Bristol), his edition of Tyndale's Jonah, i, 206.
- his monograph of "Three New Testaments of Tyndale," i, 232, n. 1.
- Fryth, Tyndale's letter to, i, 134.
- his reply to More, i, 135.
- the "Baruch to this Jeremy," i, 139.
- a fugitive and vagabond, i, 203.
- martyred, i, 216, 217.
- Fulke's story of Coverdale's defending his Bible before the king and bishops, i, 374.
- his defence of the three versions against Martin's attack, ii, 103.
- his defence of translations of Bible and dedication to the Queen, ii, 146, 149.
- on translation of proper names, ii, 147.
- on want of uniformity of rendering, ii, 136.
- Fyshe's (Simon) "Supplication of the Beggars," i, 170.
- Galloway's account of Hampton Court Conference, ii, 179.
- his career, ii, 205, 206.
- Gardynere, Bishop, and Scriptures in English tongue, i, 263.
- translation of portion of Scriptures assigned to him by Cranmer, i, 265.
- and Rogers, i, 348-350.
- his plot for Latinized edition of Bible, i, 402-404.
- his list of ninety-nine Latin terms, i, 404.
- no mean scholar, i, 404, n. 2.
- Mary's Chancellor, i, 425.
- character by Lloyd, i, 426.
- advocates Henry's repudiation of the Pope, i, 425, 426.
- and the indiscreet artist, i, 427.
- his imprudent retort to charge of instigating the queen to persecute heretics, i, 433.
- retirement and death, i, 434.
- Garrett and circulation of Tyndale's New Testament, i, 161-166.
- Gaunt's (John of) relation to Wycliffe, i, 41, n. 1; 49, 51.
- on forbidding English Scriptures, i, 83.
- Geddes, his objections and those of Hume to certain Saxon Biblical forms, ii, 129.
- on annotations of Rheims version, ii, 129.
- Gell's (Dr.), attack on Authorized Version, ii, 266, 267, n. 2.
- "Gelding," Wycliffe's word for "eunuch," i, 75, n. 2.
- Geneva, citadel of Protestantism, ii, 5.

- GENEVAN BIBLE, ii, 3-56.
- due to refugees from Marian persecution, ii, 3-5.
- preceded by New Testament of Whittingham (see Whittingham), ii, 5-9.
- scholars engaged in enterprise, ii, 10, 11.
- when finished, ii, 11.
- title, ii, 11.
- dedication to Queen Elizabeth, ii, 12.
- dedication to the Christian reader, ii, 13, 14.
- things which made it the people's book in England and Scotland, ii, 14, 15.
- called "Breeches Bible," ii, 15.
- a revision of Tyndale's Bible collated with Great Bible, ii, 16.
- collation, ii, 16, 17.
- changes due to Beza, ii, 17.
- Genevan Old Testament, decided advance on Great Bible shown by collation, ii, 18-22.
- changes to the better in Apocrypha, ii, 22.
- Latin terms, ii, 23.
- good renderings introduced by, ii, 23, 24.
- old Saxon forms and words, ii, 24, 25.
- antique words and senses, ii, 25.
- old spellings, ii, 26.
- supplementary clauses, ii, 26, 27.
- its famous marginal notes, ii, 27-30.
- their character, ii, 28-30.
- excellence of the version, ii, 30.
- its Greek text, ii, 31.
- Bodley's patent for printing, ii, 32, 33.
- first printed in England, ii, 33, 34.
- Tomson's revision of New Testament, ii, 34, 35.
- great sale of, ii, 35, 36.
- relation of Parker, Grindal, and Whitgift to, ii, 36.
- great and long continued popularity, ii, 37, 38, 51.
- in Scotland, ii, 15, 39.
- use of, by Knox, ii, 39.
- the first Bible printed in Scotland, ii, 44-47.
- title-page and dedication, ii, 45.
- some account of it, ii, 47.
- subsequent editions in Scotland, ii, 48, 49.
- overture for revision, ii, 47.
- the favourite volume in Scotland, ii, 50.
- its vitality, ii, 51, 52, 102.
- when it passed out of use, ii, 52.
- Genevan Bible—continued.
- attacked by Howson and Gregory Martin, ii, 52, 53.
- stigmatized as the work of Beza, ii, 53, 54.
- criticized by John Hamilton, ii, 54-56.
- Cotton and latest, ii, 291, n. 1.
- Genevan version and first Protestant Assembly of the Kirk, ii, 42.
- proportion of its renderings retained in Authorized Version, ii, 218.
- Gib (Muckle John), and the Sweet Singers, ii, 325, 327.
- Gifford on the Bible as well-head of English prose, ii, 232, n. 2.
- Gilby, one of the translators of Genevan Bible, ii, 11.
- Ginsburg on Coverdale's version, i, 284.
- his error in regard to Coverdale's use of "manner," i, 284, 285.
- Glosses (Anglo-Saxon), i, 14-17.
- glossa ordinaria and gloss interlinear, i, 68, 69.
- Godfray (T.), and the first issue of Tyndale's New Testament in England, i, 240.
- Gospels (Anglo-Saxon) published by Snrtees Society, i, 14, n. 2.
- "of the lower Evangelists," printed by John Daye, i, 16, n. 1.
- Polyglott published under care of Bosworth and Waring, i, 16, n. 2.
- Gower's works, i, 24, 52, n. 4.
- Guthlac's version of Psalms, i, 10.
- Guy (Thomas), founder of Guy's Hospital, imports Bibles from Continent, ii, 299.
- Grafton and Whitechurch publish edition of Coverdale's Diglott, i, 304.
- take burden of printing Matthew's Bible on themselves, i, 315.
- Grafton's letter to Crumwell regarding, i, 335, 336.
- his petition for protection against rival editions, i, 340, 341.
- at Paris with Coverdale, preparing Great Bible, i, 357-360.
- sent to prison, i, 401.
- among exiles, ii, 3, n. 1.
- his reprint of "A Godly Invective, &c.," i, 65.
- GREAT BIBLE, i, 355-440.
- Coverdale chosen as editor, i, 355.
- mistakes about origin of, i, 356.
- Crumwell the prime mover, i, 357, 365.
- Paris selected as place of printing, i, 357.

Great Bible—*continued.*

Coverdale and Grafton send two copies on parchment to Crumwell, and unfold their plan, i, 357-359.
 Bonner's connection with them, i, 359.
 Inquisitor-general interferes, i, 360.
 the volume finished in London, i, 360.
 title and frontispiece, i, 361-363.
 commendation of Grafton in connection with, i, 361.
 apology for want of notes, i, 363.
 Crumwell's measures for its circulation, i, 364.
 his own copy on vellum, where preserved, i, 364.
 size, i, 365.
 Latin version of Erasmus used by Coverdale in the revision, i, 365, 366.
 Munster and Pagninus used for revision of Old Testament, i, 366.
 collation of 2nd and 23rd Psalms, i, 367-369.
 carefulness of the revision, i, 370.
 spiteful attempts to frustrate proclamation in favour of, i, 370.
 the Bible welcomed by the people, i, 370, 371.
 new edition, with preface, by Cranmer, i, 372.
 price, i, 372.
 royal patent to Crumwell, i, 373.
 delay in publication, Fulke's account of, i, 374.
 Coverdale editor of second Great Bible as well as first, i, 375.
 Cranmer's prologue on the benefit of Scripture reading, i, 375-378.
 title, i, 378.
 changes in second edition mainly due to Munster, i, 379-383.
 Erasmus carefully studied for New Testament, i, 381, 382.
 clauses inserted in the Apocalypse, i, 382.
 seven editions of Great Bible in brief space, i, 382.
 misprint in heading of Gen. xxxix, i, 383.
 Apocrypha called Hagiographa, i, 383.
 Great Bible still the only authorized version, i, 383.
 paraphrastic and supplementary clauses from the Vulgate, i, 383-386.
 Psalms in Book of Common Prayer

Great Bible—*continued.*

taken from the Great Bible, i, 386.
 terrible years during which successive translations of the Bible were published, i, 387-394.
 Crumwell's arms erased in four last editions, i, 394.
 fourth edition bears names of Tunstall and Heath, i, 395.
 Anthony Marler bears expense of last editions, i, 397.
 prices at which he might sell them, i, 397, 399.
 proclamation enjoining all churches to provide themselves with Bible of largest volume, i, 397, 398.
 title-page of last volume of this series of Great Bible, i, 399.
 royal mandate in favour of Great Bible carried out by Bonner, Latimer, Hooper, and Lee, i, 400, 401.
 reaction, i, 401.
 Great Bible to be revised after the Latin version, i, 402.
 names of persons to whom the work was apportioned, i, 403, 404.
 Gardyners list of Latin words to be retained, i, 404.
 Cranmer outwits him, i, 405.
 Great Bible in Scotland, i, 418.
 proclamation of Queen Elizabeth in favour of, ii, 62, 63.
 Greek in Britain and Theodore of Tarsus, i, 102.
 introduced into Europe after fall of Constantinople, i, 102.
 early teachers of at Oxford and Cambridge, i, 103-105.
 Grindal and Coverdale, i, 435.
 and Genevan Bible, ii, 36.
 and Bishops', i, 71, 73, 75.
 Guest (Gheast), Bishop of Rochester, on revision, ii, 69.
 HACKET, his zeal against Tyndale's New Testament, i, 176-179.
 and Rinck, i, 178, 179.
 demands that Christopher of Endhoven be banished, i, 176.
 and importation of Tyndale's New Testament into Scotland, i, 245, 246.
 Hamilton (John), assassin of Regent Murray and censurer of Genevan Bible, ii, 54, 55.
 Hamilton and Melville in the Tower, ii, 206, n. 2.
 (Patrick), i, 247.

Hampton Court Conference, ii, 171-179.

confounded with Savoy Conference, ii, 287.
 Harman and Fyshe, i, 170.
 and Hacket, i, 178.
 released from prison, i, 231.
 and Queen Anne Boleyn, i, 231, 232.
 Heath, account of, ii, 426. (See *Tunstall and Heath*.)
 Hebrew, early study of, i, 208, 209.
 how Tyndale acquired knowledge of, i, 208.
 works on, to which he might have access, i, 209.
 his knowledge of, i, 209-215.
 Hebrew tongue rich in terms of religious emotion, ii, 386, 387, 467.
 "Helpmeet," "helpmate" the proper form of, ii, 253, n. 1.
 Henry I sneered at for use of English speech, i, 21, 22, n. 1.
 Henry III issues proclamations in French and English, i, 23.
 Henry IV and V, their relation to Lollards, i, 88, 89.
 Henry VIII and Luther, i, 162-164.
 and Matthew's Bible, i, 336-339.
 his patent conferring on Crumwell sole right to print Great Bible, i, 373.
 Hereford (Nicholas de), i, 65, 66.
 "His," old use of, ii, 257.
 Holbein's frontispiece to Great Bible, i, 361, 362.
 Hollybushe's New Testament, influence on Macknight, i, 305.
 Hooper, martyrdom of, i, 430.
 on desirableness of revision, ii, 66.
 "Hucker-mucker," i, 182, n. 3.
 Hunt on Cranmer's moderate Calvinism, ii, 372, n. 1.
 IDA, with bands of Angles, in Northumberland, i, 33.
 "Institution of a Christian Man," dedication of, to the king by prelates, i, 410.
 JAMES V, and persecution for religion, ii, 414-416.
 close connection between France and Scotland in reign of, ii, 42.
 James VI, his descent, ii, 159.
 romantic incidents which marked his infantine years, ii, 160.
 a boyish kingleit, ii, 161.
 his character made up of contrasts, i, 161-165.

James VI—*continued.*

his knowledge of scripture and theology, ii, 165.
 fondness for learned discussions, ii, 167, 168.
 changes of opinion, ii, 169, 170.
 and the Puritans, ii, 169, 174.
 flatteries heaped upon him, ii, 170.
 the millenary petition, ii, 171.
 Hampton Court Conference, ii, 171-176.
 fondness for giving nicknames, ii, 176.
 saying in regard to Genevan notes, ii, 177, 178.
 and whipping boy, ii, 178, n. 1.
 his profusion and poverty, ii, 183.
 his version did not cost him a farthing, ii, 184.
 Joye (George), his Psalter and Isaiah, i, 217.
 brings out edition of Tyndale's New Testament, i, 217.
 Tyndale's complaint regarding, i, 218, 219.
 his reply, i, 219-221.
 his account of spurious editions of Tyndale's New Testament, i, 220-222.
 controversy between him and Tyndale in regard to soul-life between death and resurrection, i, 222, 223.
 his ambition and malice, 224, 225.
 "Judas" for "Jesus" in one of the first issues of Authorized Version, ii, 291, n. 3.
 Jugge (R.), printer of an issue of Coverdale's Bible, i, 305.
 Parker asks Cecil on his behalf for printing of Bishops' Bible, ii, 75.
 his mark on Bishops' Bible, ii, 76.
 KELLISON (Dr.) and the Bible in one of the three sanctified tongues, ii, 113.
 his "Gag for the New Gospel," ii, 149.
 Keltic dialects of Britain, no version preserved in, i, 3.
 words, few preserved in English language, i, 3.
 Kilburne's Tract, ii, 290, 298.
 Kilbye, story of, by Walton, ii, 188.
 Knyghton on John Ball, i, 52.
 on number of Lollards, i, 53.
 on Wycliffe's character, i, 57.
 on his translation, i, 81.
 "Known men," i, 95.
 Knox (John) and Genevan Bible, ii, 9, 10.

- Knox (John)—*continued*.
two sons born to him at Geneva, ii, 10, n. 2.
his erudition, ii, 41.
conversations with Queen Mary, ii, 42, n. 1.
and translation of Genevan Bible, ii, 10.
- LANGTOFT'S (Pierre de) Chronicle, i, 24.
Laseo (John A.), ii, 3.
Latin version, its two forms, i, 17.
Latimer's letters to king on English Bible, i, 261, 262.
Laud's dislike of Genevan, ii, 52.
Lauderdale (Duke of) and copy of Matthew's Bible with "kneawe" for "servaunte," i, 352.
Lanfranc scorns native saints, i, 20.
Lawney (Thomas) on Stokesley, i, 265.
Layamon's Chronicle of Britain, ii, 29, n. 2.
Lawrence, his critical remarks on Bishops' Bible, i, 79-84.
Lemoine's complaint of want of pocket Bibles, ii, 306.
Lingard's new version of Four Gospels, ii, 153, 154.
Lollards, origin of name, i, 84.
arguments against, i, 84, 85.
stigmatized not as traitors, but as heretics, i, 85.
persecutions of, i, 87-94.
in Scotland, i, 96.
London (Dr.), his furious zeal against Bible readers, 408, n. 1.
Luft (Hans), printer of Tyndale's Pentateuch, i, 204.
Luther and Tyndale (see *Tyndale*).
Luther's first intimation of purpose to translate New Testament, i, 143, n. 1.
Lydgate, priest and minor poet, i, 87.
Lyndwood's digest, i, 61, n. 1.
Lyra (Nicholas de) and Purvey's Prologue, i, 68, 69.
- MACALPINE, brother-in-law of Coverdale, i, 431, 432.
McCrie's (Dr.), error with regard to Wishart's recantation, i, 419.
Macregol, writer of Rushworth Gloss, i, 14, 15.
Magna Charta makes no mention of different races, i, 23.
Mandeville's Travels translated out of French into English, i, 24.
"Manner," use of, by Coverdale and others, i, 284.
Marbeck's Concordance, i, 350, 351.
- Marler defrays expense of last edition of Great Bible, i, 397, 398.
royal proclamation in his interest, i, 405, 406.
- Martin (Gregory) stigmatized Genevan Bible as taken from Beza, ii, 53.
attacks plurality of versions, ii, 101, 102.
and Douai Version, ii, 115.
attacks on English Version, ii, 147, 148.
- Mary (Bloody), her reign, i, 425-434.
numbers who perished for their religious opinions during, i, 428.
- Mary, Queen of Scots, pensions assassin of her brother, ii, 54.
appeals to Rheims New Testament, ii, 136.
sends baptismal font to the mint, ii, 160.
- MATTHEW'S BIBLE, 309-352.
title-page and description of, i, 309-311.
John Rogers, editor, i, 311 (see *Rogers*).
the name Matthew, i, 312-314.
origination of volume, i, 314.
where and when printed, i, 314.
Grafton and Whitechurch take on themselves the burden of printing, i, 315-340.
connection of Tyndale and Coverdale with, errors regarding, i, 315-318.
a composite volume partly taken from Tyndale, partly from Coverdale, i, 319-325.
two-thirds Tyndale's, one-third Coverdale's, i, 324.
prefatory matter, i, 326-328.
changes on Coverdale made by Rogers, i, 328, 329.
Coverdale and Rogers on Apocrypha, i, 329-331.
the notes, i, 331-334.
Cranmer and Crumwell, their connection with the volume, i, 335-340.
the royal license procured for it, i, 336.
royal proclamation to curates regarding, i, 336, 337.
boldness of the movement, i, 337, 338.
dedication, i, 339.
Grafton's petition against rival editions, i, 341.
Taverner's edition (see *Taverner*).
other editions, i, 346, 347.

- Matthew's Bible—*continued*.
first English Concordance sprang out of the study of Matthew's Bible, i, 350 (see *Marbeck*).
"servaunte" changed into "kneawe" in this Bible, i, 352.
Mazarin Bible, i, 105, n. 3.
Melville (Andrew), ii, 41, 206, 207.
Melville (James), his Diary on unpopularity of Scotchmen in England, i, 207, n. 1.
"Merchant's House" in Antwerp, i, 311.
connection of Rogers and Lambert with, i, 311, n. 4.
Mendicant Orders, Chaucer's scourging of, i, 48.
Millenary Petition, ii, 171.
Milligan (Professor) on relative constructions in Matthew's Gospel, ii, 254, n. 1.
Mill (Walter) martyred, ii, 40.
Misquotations of Scripture, i, 328-330.
Money, value of, in time of Tyndale, i, 118.
Monopoly (Bible), ii, 324, 325.
More (Sir Thomas) and study of Greek, i, 104.
date of birth, i, 109.
on Tyndale's degree, i, 109, 110.
on Tyndale as Lutheran, i, 122, 123.
critical attacks on Tyndale's New Testament, i, 187-190.
his anomalous character, i, 190-193.
his zeal against heretics, i, 193, 194.
his outrageous railing, i, 194-196.
his criticism of nay and no, i, 197, 198.
his confession of defeat, i, 199.
Mulcaster and Puttenham on the English tongue of their period, i, 239, 240.
Munmouth (Humphrey) and Tyndale, i, 116, 117, 124.
Munster and Pagninus used for revision of Old Testament of Great Bible, i, 366.
- Necton's confession with regard to circulation of Tyndale's New Testament, i, 169.
- Nary's Revision of Douai Version, ii, 153.
- "Nay" and "No," More's criticism on, i, 197.
- Netter (de Walden) and Wycliffe, i, 52, 56, 57, 58, n. 1.
- Nikke (Bishop) and Tyndale's New Testament, i, 174, 183, 184.
- Norman invasion, effect of, on English tongue and people, i, 19, 20.
- Normandy, loss of, its effect on English tongue, i, 23.
- Nycolson, printer of Coverdale's edition, 1537, i, 280, 301, 302.
printer of Hollybushe's New Testament, i, 305.
- OCCLEVE, frigid poet, sings of Bradbee's martyrdom, i, 87.
- Offor, fragment of Tyndale's New Testament, referred to by, i, 121.
his error in regard to Matthew's Bible, i, 317.
- Olivetian's French Bible, ii, 5.
- Origen's labours on Septuagint, ii, 337.
- Ormulum (The), i, 30.
- Overall, one of the translators of Authorized Version, ii, 186.
- Owen's controversy with Walton on text of Scripture, ii, 339-341.
- PACKINGTON and Tunstall, i, 179-181.
his brother shot, i, 181, n. 2.
- Parker (Dr.) and Tyndale, 113.
and Tracy, 113, n. 1.
- Pagninus Sanctes, i, 286.
his version used by Coverdale, i, 281, 286-291.
- Paragraph marks in Authorized Version, ii, 309.
- Parker (Archbishop), his connection with Genevan Bible, ii, 33, 36.
succeeds Pole as Archbishop of Canterbury, ii, 59, 60.
some account of, ii, 66.
his passion for uniformity, ii, 66.
intimates to Cecil his design for Bishops' Bible, ii, 70.
letter to the Queen, intimating completion of, ii, 73, 74.
on affectionate terms with fellow-workers, ii, 75.
his preface, ii, 77.
Genevan notes disparaged by, ii, 74, 93.
- Patentees, George I issues orders to, with regard to correctors of press, ii, 306.
- Pavier, anecdote of, ii, 311.
- Pecock's Repressor, i, 70.
his combination of rationalism and ultramontaniam, i, 84, 85.
- "Pilgrimage of Grace," i, 338.
- Plowman (Piers), his vision, i, 48, 49.

- Pole (Cardinal) returns to England in Mary's reign, i, 425.
 refused to be consecrated while Cranmer lived, i, 426.
 Queen's principal adviser, i, 434.
 Polychronicon (The), 20, n. 3.
 Polyglott Complutensian, Tyndale not acquainted with, i, 142.
 Antwerp, ii, 209.
 Porter (John) and Sir G. Harvey's picture of the reading of the Bible in old St. Paul's, ii, 400, n. 2.
 Price of Bishop's Bible, ii, 94.
 of Geneva in Scotland, ii, 43.
 of Great, i, 397, 399.
 Tyndale's, i, 166, 168, 169.
 Wycliffe's, i, 91, 92.
 Poyntz, Tyndale's host at Antwerp, i, 238, 239, 240, n. 2.
 Printing, invention of, i, 105.
 spread of, i, 106.
 Gutenberg and Fust, i, 105.
 Caxton, i, 106.
 effect of printing in cheapening books, i, 106.
 Roman and Italic letters, i, 106, n. 1.
 interesting information in regard to printing of Bibles, ii, 307, n. 3.
 Prest (Agnes) and Raleigh's mother, ii, 61.
 Psalms, Richard Rolle's version of, i, 31, 32.
 Psalter, popularity of, i, 32, 33.
 Hyde's (John) MS. of, i, 31.
 Punctuation, how it has varied in Authorized Version, ii, 308, 309.
 ambiguity arising from, ii, 379-382.
 Puritan described as a Protestant frayed out of his wits, ii, 325.
 Purvey, ii, 66-69.
 Pykas (John), and MS. Bible, i, 194.
 and Tyndale's New Testament, i, 166.
 QUENTEL and the Byrckmans, their connection with printing of Tyndale's New Testament, i, 128, 129.
 Quijote (Don) on translation, ii, 353, n. 2.
 RAVIUS (Chris.), his statement with regard to number of copies of English Bible issued in 1646, ii, 297, n. 1.
 Regnault, printer of new edition of Coverdale's Diglott, i, 304.
 of Great Bible, i, 357.
 Religious Houses, suppression of, i, 387, n. 1, 403.
 "Replication," ridiculous punishment of attorney in connection with, i, 193, n. 3.
 Resby (John), follower of Wycliffe, burned at Perth, i, 96.
 REVISION of present translation, ii, 337-484.
 dread of, ii, 343.
 desirableness of shown by Dr. Lightfoot and other scholars, ii, 333, 334.
 bill for, in the Long Parliament, ii, 344-347.
 prepared for by labours on the original text, ii, 347-352.
 true nature of, ii, 353.
 present version result of frequent revision, ii, 354.
 fatality of objections to, by Earl of Shaftesbury, late Lord Panmure, Dr. Cumming, Dr. McCaul, ii, 355.
 objections answered, ii, 354-357.
 previous attempts at, criticized, ii, 358-363.
 that of Scarlett, ii, 358.
 Heinfetter, Davidson, Rotherham, and others, ii, 359.
 Darby, Baptist American Bible Union, Mace, ii, 360.
 Dickenson, Noah Webster, ii, 361.
 Alford, Penn, Macknight, Religious Tract Society, Tauchnitz's Thousandth Volume, ii, 362.
 "Five Clergymen," M'Lellan, ii, 363.
 works on, ii, 363.
 required by defects of Authorized Version, ii, 365.
 ambiguities, ii, 366-372.
 inexact renderings, ii, 372-378.
 doubtful punctuation and other points calling for amendment, ii, 378-382.
 want of uniformity of rendering, ii, 383 ss.
 uniformity not always possible, ii, 384, 385.
 hut to be kept wherever it may, ii, 385.
 since each of the inspired writers has his own style, ii, 385, 386.
 terms characteristic of a Divine revelation, ii, 386, 387.
 variations, unnecessary, but not affecting the sense, ii, 387-391.
 capricious and bewildering, ii, 393-395.
 which obscure the meaning, ii, 395-397.

- Revision of present translation—variations—continued.
 motivated in some cases, ii, 397-399.
 specific instances of,
 in parable, ii, 399.
 charity, ii, 400.
 put to death, ii, 400.
 comfortless, ii, 400.
 thief, ii, 400.
 common, ii, 400, 401.
 Holy Ghost, ii, 401.
 child, ii, 401.
 multitude, ii, 401, 402.
 implacable, ii, 402.
 in Matthew, ii, 402, 403.
 characteristics of Mark's style obscured, ii, 403.
 in Luke, John, Acts, ii, 404-406.
 Paul's repeated use of same term obscured, ii, 406-413.
 goodly apparel, appearing, damnable, ii, 413.
 rich, thrones, wonder, cage, ii, 414, 415.
 one English term represents several Greek words, ii, 416.
 distinctions thereby effaced, ii, 417.
 brightness, ii, 417, 418.
 crown, people, Godhead, ii, 418.
 true, temple, ii, 419.
 life, love, ii, 420.
 new, light, ii, 421.
 clusters of instances, ii, 422-425.
 child, ii, 425.
 immortality, ii, 426.
 sickness, ii, 426.
 beasts, ii, 426, 427.
 poor, ii, 427.
 dead, ii, 427.
 world, ii, 427, 428.
 will, ii, 428.
 weep, servant, judge, ii, 429.
 wash, other, ii, 430.
 remission, conformed, burden, repent, ii, 431.
 bring forth, to do—to make, ii, 432.
 hell, ii, 432.
 devil—demon, ii, 433, 434.
 miracle, sign, wonder, ii, 434, 435.
 anacolouthon and paronomasia, ii, 435, 436.
 article (the Greek), translators guided by no fixed principle in dealing with, ii, 437.
 inconsistencies, ii, 437-440.
 before the name Christ, ii, 440.

- Revision of present translation—article—continued.
 point frequently lost by omission of, ii, 440-443.
 wrong insertion of, ii, 443, 444.
 overpressed, ii, 444.
 tenses, ii, 445-455.
 aorist rendered by perfect, ii, 445-447.
 perfect rendered by present, ii, 447-449.
 perfect and pluperfect, ii, 449, 450.
 Epistle to Hebrews characterized by use of perfect, ii, 450.
 imperfect not correctly rendered, ii, 450-452.
 present misrendered, ii, 452-455.
 Mark and the use of the present, ii, 453, 454.
 Greek verbs corresponding to "become" and "be" confounded, ii, 456, 457.
 prepositions, ii, 458-465.
 rendering of *ἐν*, ii, 458-460.
οὐ, ii, 460-462.
ἐκ, ii, 462, 463.
ἐκ and *ἀπό*, ii, 463.
ὑπέρ and *πρός*, ii, 463, 464.
ἐπὶ and *πρός*, ii, 464, 465.
 particles, ii, 479.
 conjunctions, *ὅτι* and *ὅτι*, ii, 465.
 names (proper), how dealt with, ii, 466-471.
 most familiar forms employed, ii, 466.
 Jehovah, ii, 467.
 want of uniformity, ii, 467-470.
 official, ii, 470.
 Chaldee, ii, 471.
 plural forms wrongly given, ii, 471.
 untranslated, ii, 471, 472.
 terms connected with the land of Palestine and its productions, ii, 472-479.
 works on, ii, 472, 473.
 the Land illustrates the Book, ii, 473.
 errors in rendering terms belonging to botany and zoology, ii, 474-477.
 satyr, unicorn, &c., ii, 474.
 variety of rendering, thistle, owl, &c., 475.
 apple, spikenard, thorn, &c., ii, 476.
 rye, corn, silk, ii, 477.
 topographical terms, abundance of in Hebrew, ii, 477-478.
 weights, measures, and coins, terms for, ii, 478, 479.

- Revision, notices of that which is at present in progress, ii, 481-484.
- Rheims and Douai Version (see *Douai*).
- Richard II speaks to rebels in their birth tongue, i, 24.
- Richard III, statutes of, the first recorded in English, i, 24.
- Ridley's (uncle of martyr) depreciation of Tyndale's New Testament, i, 185.
- Rinck acts as a spy on Tyndale and his work, i, 178, 179.
- consulted by Cochlaeus in regard to Tyndale's printing of New Testament, i, 129.
- his letter to Wolsey in regard to Bibles taken into Scotland and England, i, 247.
- Robert (of Gloucester), his metrical chronicle, i, 20.
- Rogers (John), early history, i, 311.
- quits England for Antwerp, i, 311.
- intimacy with Tyndale and Coverdale, i, 312.
- marriage, i, 312.
- edits Matthew's Bible, i, 312 (see *Matthew's Bible*).
- returns to England on accession of Edward VI, i, 347.
- preferments, i, 347.
- ordered, under Mary, to keep himself a prisoner in his own house, i, 348.
- examination before Gardiner, i, 348.
- martyrdom, i, 350.
- his descendants, i, 350.
- "Roger's Rhyme to his Children," i, 314.
- Roman or Western Church, the good it wrought, ii, 110, 111.
- its exclusiveness and repression of free thought, i, 111, 112.
- its reluctance to give vernacular Scriptures to the people, i, 112.
- reasons for the refusal, i, 113.
- Romance languages, i, 18, n. 3.
- Rouse's Psalms, ii, 314, n. 1.
- Rough (John) martyred, i, 430.
- Rows (the), a Scottish family of note for learning, ii, 322, n. 1.
- Row (John), his proposals for revision, ii, 322-324.
- Roye (William) and Tyndale, i, 110, 111.
- in what sense an assistant of Tyndale, i, 139, 140.
- his "railing rhymes," i, 171.
- Ruremond (John) and printing of Tyndale's New Testament, i, 177-185.
- Rushworth Gloss, i, 14, 15.
- published by Surtees' Society, i, 14, n. 2.
- SANDERS (Nicholas) and Douai Bible, ii, 116.
- Sandys (Bishop) on importance of revision, ii, 67.
- Sautre sent to stake, i, 187.
- Scandinavian invasions of France, i, 18.
- Schœffer finishes the printing of Tyndale's New Testament, i, 130.
- Schorham's translations of the Psalms into Old English, i, 31.
- Scotland, how affected by Norman influence, i, 31, notes.
- French terms still preserved in common speech of, ii, 42, n. 1.
- books and readers in, during 16th and 17th centuries, ii, 312.
- independence and poverty, ii, 312, 313.
- Bible in, no indigenous translation, ii, 312, 313.
- no lack of scholars qualified for the work, ii, 41, 42.
- content to receive versions of the Bible from England and Continent, ii, 313, 314.
- Wycliffe's, i, 96-98.
- Tyndale's New Testament imported, i, 245, 246.
- martyrdoms in connection with, i, 246-248, 414, 416.
- Great Bible, Act passed, and proclamation made in favour of free Bible circulation, i, 416-418.
- reaction and martyrdom of Adam Wallace, George Wishart, and others, i, 419.
- Genevan Bible, first Assembly of the Kirk, and, ii, 39, 42.
- first Bible issued in, ii, 42, 43.
- Arnhuthnot and Bassandyn, printers, ii, 43.
- George Young, corrector, ii, 44.
- publication and dedication to the king, ii, 45.
- enactment requiring householders to have copy of, ii, 46.
- no change of orthography from English edition, ii, 48.
- Greek types, insufficient supply of, ii, 47.
- subsequent editions, ii, 48, 49.
- favourite volume in Scottish households, ii, 50, 51.
- enactment regarding, by Diocesan Synod of St. Andrews, ii, 50.
- quoted by Scottish writers, ii, 51.

- Scotland—continued.
- Authorized Version, its success as rapid there as in England, ii, 314-316.
- refused by the "Sweet Singers," ii, 225-327.
- editions of (see *Authorized Version*).
- Bible printing now under supervision of Board in Edinburgh, ii, 324, 325.
- Bibliolatriy in, ii, 327.
- Scottish tongue (old), works in, i, 97.
- "Scrip," meaning of, in Authorized Version, ii, 376.
- Scrivener (Dr.) and the English Church, ii, 205, n. 1.
- his Cambridge Bible, ii, 310.
- "Sir" as applied to Tyndale and others, i, 119.
- Skeat's Anglo-Saxon Mark, i, 28, n. 1.
- Smith (Dr. Myles) and Dr. Bilson superintend Authorized Version at press, ii, 20.
- Somerville (Mrs.) and Scottish Bibliolatriy, ii, 327.
- Spencer, Bishop of Norwich, massacres population of Gravelines, i, 46, n. 4.
- Spiridon (Bishop) and the preacher in Cyprus, ii, 235, n. 1.
- Steelyard (the) i, 125, n. 1.
- Stokesley and the translation of the Scriptures, i, 264.
- "Supplication (the) of the Poor Commons," i, 396.
- on restrictions of Bible reading, i, 412, 413.
- Swinderby, poor priest and preacher, i, 79.
- Stuart's (Esme, Duke of Lennox) vile hypocrisy, ii, 38.
- TAVERNER edits revised edition of Matthew's Bible, i, 343.
- editions, i, 343.
- his dedication to the king, i, 344.
- his scholarship and the changes made by him, i, 344-346.
- his alliterative conceits, i, 334, n. 1.
- Tellier (Le), sworn scribe of the Holy Office and printing of Great Bible at Paris, i, 360.
- Text, Hebrew, of Old Testament, ii, 209.
- Greek, of New Testament used by translators of Authorized Version, ii, 211-214.
- Text (original), alarm created by attempts to amend, ii, 338-343.
- Origen's labours on, ii, 338.
- Stephen's, ii, 339.
- Walton's Polyglott, and Owen's considerations on, ii, 339-342.
- Bengel assailed, ii, 342.
- Mill's New Testament, panic caused by, ii, 342.
- Bentley's exposure of the folly of such panic, ii, 342.
- Bentley's principles, ii, 347.
- textual critics, ii, 347.
- changes in Greek Text, ii, 349-352.
- Theodore (Archbishop) and the native tongue, i, 4.
- and knowledge of Greek in Britain, i, 102.
- Thornton (Captain) and change of "servaunte" into "kneawe," i, 331, 332.
- "Thought," Greg's mistake with regard to meaning of, ii, 254, n. 2.
- Thorpe (William) and Tyndale, i, 97, 98.
- Thoulouse, Council of, forbids Scriptures to laity, i, 89, n. 1.
- Tischendorf (Constantine von) and Sinaitic MS, ii, 364.
- and Lachmann, ii, 347, 348.
- misprints in his English New Testament, ii, 314.
- Tomson's (Lawrence) edition of Genevan New Testament, ii, 34.
- Topley (T.) and Coverdale, i, 256, 257.
- Translator, qualifications for a, ii, 479, 480.
- Tregelles, ii, 364.
- Trevisa in regard to French and English, i, 24.
- translates Higden's Polychronicon, i, 24, n. 4.
- his claim to have translated the Scriptures, i, 60, 61, n. 2.
- Tunstall, Tyndale's application to, i, 115.
- his hostility to Tyndale's New Testament, i, 173, 174.
- outwitted by Packington, i, 179, 180.
- and Heath, first edition of Great Bible, with names of, i, 395.
- a scholar of eminence, i, 396.
- one of Mary's favourite bishops, i, 425.
- Tyball confesses to having Paul's Epistles after old translation, i, 94.
- and Tyndale's New Testament, i, 166.
- Tyler's rising and Wycliffe's teaching, i, 50, 51.

Tyndale (John) punished for corresponding with his brother, i, 193.
 TYNDALE, i, 107-248.
 place and date of birth, i, 107-109.
 the name Hichens, i, 108.
 at Oxford, i, 109.
 his early love for the Bible, 109.
 removes to Cambridge, i, 110.
 no record of his ordination, i, 110.
 tutor with Sir John Walsh, i, 111-114.
 controversies with the clergy, i, 113, 114.
 rejection by Tunstall, i, 115.
 residence with Humphrey Munmouth, i, 116.
 manner of life in London, i, 116-118.
 meaning of title "Sir," as applied to him, i, 118-119.
 leaves London for Hamburg, i, 120, 121.
 connection with Wittenberg and Luther, i, 121-128.
 his knowledge of German, i, 127, 128.
 at Cologne puts New Testament to press, i, 128.
 Cochlaus discovers his work, i, 129.
 his flight to Worms, i, 129.
 brings out two editions of New Testament, quarto and octavo, i, 130, 131.
 separate editions of Matthew and Mark, i, 131, 132.
 noble and disinterested motives, i, 133.
 letter to Vaughan, i, 134.
 and Fryth, i, 134, 135, 216.
 his modesty, i, 135.
 his scholarship, i, 136-137.
 the sole translator, i, 138.
 assistants incorrectly assigned to him, i, 138, 139.
 and Friar Roye, i, 139-141.
 helps, i, 141.
 editions of Greek Testament of Erasmus used by, i, 141-142.
 relation of Tyndale's translation to that of Luther, i, 143-146.
 examples of influence of Luther's version on that of Tyndale, i, 146.
 use of Vulgate, i, 146, 149.
 illustrations of Tyndale's independence of Vulgate, i, 149-150.
 renderings suggested by Vulgate, i, 150, 151.
 Tyndale's neglect of the Greek particles, i, 151, 152.
 incorrect renderings, i, 152-153.
 paraphrastic, i, 153, 154.

Tyndale—*continued*.
 quaint and homely, i, 155-156.
 happy, i, 156-159.
 Fuller's eulogy, i, 159.
 archaic forms and peculiar spelling, i, 159, 160.
 time when Tyndale's New Testament arrived in England, i, 161-167.
 circulation by Barnes, Necton, Constantine, Fyshe, and Harman, i, 168-170.
 alarm of the authorities, i, 171.
 Tunstall's manifesto, i, 173.
 Warham's mandate, i, 173.
 Bishop Nikke's offer, i, 174.
 third edition of New Testament, issued at Antwerp and conveyed to England along with provisions, i, 174, 175.
 circulation detected, i, 175.
 zeal of Hacket at Antwerp, i, 176, 177.
 Ruremond's (John) edition in great letter, i, 177.
 Harman apprehended, i, 178.
 Rinck employed to apprehend Roye and Tyndale, i, 178, 179.
 Tunstall outwitted, i, 179-182.
 Tyndale's edition, with epilogue to the Epistle to the Romans, i, 182.
 Tunstall burns New Testament, i, 184.
 charges the volume with containing more than two thousand errors, i, 185.
 More's "Dialogue," a critical attack, i, 187-189.
 Tyndale's reply, i, 190, 196, 197.
 More's "Confutation" and "Apology," i, 198, 199.
 Tyndale rebuts objections to English translation of Scripture, i, 201.
 at Marburg, joined by Fryth, i, 203.
 "Parable of the Wicked Mammon," "Obedience of a Christian Man," "Practice of Prelates," i, 204.
 Translation of Pentateuch, i, 204, 205.
 Jonah, i, 205.
 Historical Books, i, 319-322.
 Prologue to Jonah, i, 206.
 Exposition of Sermon on Mount, and Commentary on I John, i, 206, 207.
 Tyndale's Hebrew helps, i, 208, 209.
 evidence that he translated from Hebrew, i, 209-214.
 Quaint renderings from his Old Testament, i, 215.

Tyndale—*continued*.
 Tyndale and Joye, i, 217-225.
 Tyndale's revision of his New Testament, i, 225, 226.
 collation showing its thoroughness, i, 227-231.
 terms changed in course of successive revisions, i, 231.
 copy of revised edition presented to Queen Anne, i, 232.
 editions of 1535, collated from Fry's monograph, with Matthew, i, 233, 234.
 peculiar spelling of edition of 1535, i, 234.
 Vaughan and Tyndale, i, 235, 236.
 Tyndale's life at Antwerp, i, 236, 237.
 Sir Thomas Elyot undertakes to seize him, i, 237.
 Tyndale at the house of Poyntz, i, 238, 239.
 arrested and imprisoned, i, 239, 240.
 during his imprisonment, his New Testament passes through press at home, i, 240.
 failure of efforts in his favour, i, 241, 242.
 letter of Tyndale in prison, to the Marquis of Bergeu-op-Zoom, i, 242.
 his martyrdom, i, 243, 254.
 Wycliffe and Tyndale, i, 244.
 Tyndale's New Testament in Scotland, i, 245-248.
 Tyndale and Coverdale, i, 251-255.
 Types (Hebrew and Greek), lack of, ii, 47.
 Wynkyn de Worde and Lekprevik in regard to, ii.
 UDALL (Nicholas), translator of Erasmus, i, 423, n. 1.
 Ussher (Archbishop), his chronology, ii, 217.
 VAUGHAN, Tyndale appeals to, i, 120, 134.
 interviews with Tyndale at Antwerp, i, 235.
 his despatches in regard to him, i, 235, 236.
 Verses, chapters first divided into, in English Bible, ii, 8.
 originated by Robert Stephens, ii, 8, n. 2.
 Versions of Scripture, modern European, before the Reformation, i, 253, n. 2.

Veruliet (Daniel), printer of Douai version, i, 182.
 "Vinegar Bible," ii, 15, n. 1.
 Voysey's impoverishment of see of Exeter, i, 439, 440.
 Vulgate, account of, ii, 107-110.
 and Itala, i, 17.
 Walton, controversy between Owen and, ii, 339.
 Ward's (Thomas) attack on Authorized Version, ii, 267.
 Warham and Tyndale's New Testament, i, 173, 174.
 regarding English Bible for the people, i, 259, 260.
 Waste (Joan) condemned and burnt, ii, 61.
 Watson's (James) Bibles, ii, 321.
 Westminster, council at, 24th May, 1530, in regard to an Authorized Bible, i, 184.
 Whitchurch, Great Bible called by his name, ii, 218. See *Grafton*.
 married widow of Crammer, ii, 218, n. 2.
 Whitgift and Genevan Bible, ii, 35, 36, 101.
 his hostility to Cartwright, ii, 149.
 Whittaker, his errors in regard to Great Bible, i, 280, 281, 282, 284.
 Whittingham (W.), account of, ii, 5, 6.
 his Genevan New Testament, ii, 5, 6.
 his own account of, ii, 6, 7.
 epistle prefixed by John Calvin, ii, 7.
 not first edition of that in Genevan Bible, ii, 7.
 description of, ii, 8, 9.
 in this New Testament, chapters first divided into verses, ii, 8.
 his Psalms in collection of Sternhold and Hopkins, ii, 6, n. 2.
 William the Conqueror and English tongue, i, 20, 21, n. 1.
 Wiseman (Cardinal), and vernacular versions of Scripture, ii, 113.
 Witchcraft, Authorized Version charged with favouring, i, 269, 270.
 Wolsey condemned no one to flames for religious opinions, i, 167, 168.
 his license to Latimer, i, 172.
 his character, i, 172, 173.
 WYCLIFFE (John de), i, 30-98.
 time and place of birth, i, 38.
 academic life, i, 39, 40, nn.
 doctrines, i, 40, 42.
 persecutions, i, 40, 41, 81, 82.
 livings, i, 40.
 his patron, John of Gaunt, i, 41, n. 1.

Wycliffe—continued.

- death, i, 41, n. 3.
- his bones, i, 82.
- literary works, i, 41, 42.
- three epochs in life of, i, 42, 43.
- purity of character, i, 57.

WYCLIFFE'S BIBLE, i, 44-98.

- when Wycliffe first resolved to give English Bible to his age, i, 44.
- causes which led to this resolution, i, 45, 48.

Papal rapacity, i, 45-47.

state of mendicant orders, i, 47.

alarming condition of church and state, i, 48, 49.

the Black Death, i, 49.

Wat Tyler's revolt and Wycliffe's alleged connection with, i, 50-54.

his desire that Scripture should be standard of appeal, i, 56, 57.

nobleness of aim in translating Scriptures, i, 58, 59.

Wycliffe shown to have been the first to translate the entire Bible into English, i, 59, 63.

Wycliffe's own part in the work of translating, i, 64.

that of Nicholas de Hereford, i, 65, 66.

revision of translation commenced by Wycliffe, i, 66.

carried through by Purvey, i, 66-69.

Wycliffe's Bible—continued.

second version often confounded with first, i, 69, 70.

modern editions of, i, 69, 70.

language of, i, 69-78.

circulation of, by poor priests, i, 79.

surviving copies of, i, 80, 81.

hostility to, and to followers, i, 81-90.

Act de Heretico Comburendo, i, 85.

fires of Smithfield, i, 87.

Arundel constitutions, i, 89.

stealthy reading of, i, 91.

nefarious means of detecting Bible readers, i, 93.

prices paid for, i, 91, 92.

influence of, continued to time of Tyndale, i, 94, 95.

in Scotland, i, 96-98.

Wylliams (Robert), his note on Bible reading, i, 413.

XIMENES (Cardinal) and Complutensian Polyglott, ii, 112.

shuddered at the idea of giving Bible to the Moors in their own tongue, ii, 112.

YEARS, terrible, 1534-1541, i, 387-390.

ZÜRICH BIBLE, i, 285, n. 1.

Coverdale's use of, i, 281-285 (see *Coverdale*).